

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 2.

JUNE, 1890.

No. 3.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

DID THE EARLY CHURCHES OF NEW ENGLAND REQUIRE ASSENT TO A CREED?

BY REV. HENRY MARTYN DEXTER, D.D., EDITOR OF *The Congregationalist*, BOSTON.

It is well known that, certainly for the last half century, those churches commonly called "Orthodox Congregational," have been in the habit of holding—in addition to the Covenant, assent to which is their bond of union—a specific Confession of Faith, essential doctrinal accord with which has been, save by exception, required as a prerequisite to membership. The question whether this were the custom of our fathers, or an innovation—wisely or unwisely—provoked by, and introduced at the date of, the "Unitarian Controversy," has been lately raised. Waiving the subject of that wisdom or unwisdom, I propose to answer the purely historic question thus propounded.

Evangelical Confessions of Faith are held to date from the last half of the sixteenth century, and differ with the Christianity which they displaced mainly in a re-emphasis of those doctrines of Augustine which Romanism had gradually impaired, through the semi-Pelagianism with which it had become infected. Luther and Calvin drew somewhat different conclusions from the same premises. The *Institutes* of the latter, making the divine predestination the corner-stone of its system, became in due time the formative force, which in a mild degree shaped the Thirty-nine Articles, and, more intensely (and more logically), the Westminster Symbol. And when, in the earliest years of the seventeenth century a controversy was provoked in Holland through the denial by Arminius of the doctrines of Reprobation, and of Original Sin in its extreme sense, and the Synod of Dort—that *sacro-sancta Synodus*, as one of its Basle members always (uncovering his head) reverently called it—in its Five Points declared itself for the old Calvinism; on the part of Puritan believers it was the general conviction of the time that a statement of religious doctrine so perfect in its biblical spirit, and

so triumphant in its rational quality, as to make it complete and unalterable—the unquestionable theology of the future—had been reached. There is the most abundant evidence that John Robinson shared this conviction [*Defence of the Doctrine Propounded by the Synode at Dort*—passim].

The great subject of interest with Nonconformists and Separatists when in conscience driven to differ with, and go out from, the Established Churches in England and on the Continent, was the Covenant. No direct question of doctrine was raised between them. As to religious faith all were at one, and there was no call to reaffirm anything. But they who were trying to reform the Reformed, felt that it was against the Gospel to hold men as born into the Church simply by being born into the commonwealth and baptized therein. And no way occurred to them for binding together again those who from conscience left the establishment, so good as that of affiliating them in local bodies by mutual covenant. Hence, in the beginning, they made much of that. The earliest Congregational Church document—after the Scriptures—which survives, is Barrowe's *True Description, Out of the Word of God, of the Visible Church* (1589); but its four-and-thirty Articles all respect not the doctrinal but the ecclesiastical relations and functions of the body. Seven years before, indeed, Robert Browne [*Booke which Sheweth the Life and Manners of all True Christians, etc.*, (1582)] had gone carefully over the main grounds of theology; but he seems to have done so for the instruction of his humble company, and I find no evidence of any sifting purpose therein, whether at Norwich, or Middelberg. But, by 1596, the London Congregational Church—then mostly barracked in the Fleet, the Clink, Newgate, Bridewell, the White Lyon, and the Wood Street and Poultry Compters—felt compelled publicly

to "stop the mouths of impious and vnreasonable men," who had accused them of being "most notorious obstinate hereticks," and "a dangerous people holding manie errors," and "obteyned to publish" *A True Confession* of their faith (1596); the first sixteen of whose five-and-forty Articles make it clear that, as to God's nature and man's nature, the Bible as the rule of faith, and the person, work, and kingdom of Christ, they were orthodox by the common standards of their time—differing from their fellow-believers only in what concerns church administration, and its relation to purity of doctrine. A contemporary *Harleian Manuscript* [No. 7042: 108, 113, 399] shows that when a man joined this church it was only required that he make "y^e Protestation: that he wold walke with the rest of y^m so longe as they did walke in the way of the Lorde; & as farr as might be warranted by the word of God." And when, two years later, the Church, by that time in exile in Amsterdam, translated its Articles into the then language of scholars [*Confessio Fidei Anglorum Quorundam in Belgia Exviantium* (1598)] and sent them out for the criticism of the learned men of the universities, they declare themselves as moved thereto: "Calumnijs et quidem gravissimis à nostratibus domi laccessiti." [14]

It is clear, then, that our New England fathers in coming out of the Church of England, whether timidly and illogically into Nonconformity, or boldly and squarely into Separatism, were, so to speak, between two fires. On the one side, they were denounced as unauthorized and irregular companies, having no claim to call themselves churches, and no lawful basis for existence, ministry, or ordinances. It was urged that there is no warrant for a covenant in Scripture, and that to hold such a doctrine was to unchurch all not so confederate. To meet this they insisted on the validity and sufficiency of "the bond of an holy Covenant;" argued that a warrant to gather churches was authority for all things warrantably implied; and provided for the church entity of real believers otherwise conditioned, by the hypothesis that they might be considered as practically embodied, through the force of an unwritten and unspoken "implicit covenant." On the other side they, at first, contented themselves with the solemn declaration that they were "like-minded for & with all other reformed Churches in points of greatest moment." The "Ancient English Church in Amsterdam," in or about 1603, communicated to King James the First fourteen particulars—all touching the

ecclesiastical aspects of Christianity—as constituting the "sole difference between vs, and the Church of England as it now standeth." But it was not long before the vagaries of John Smyth, who had started out of the same mind with them, but soon re-baptized himself and his company, and went on to make a further split by adopting Arminian views (so that his own Anabaptist Church cast him out with a minority who followed him, leading to the publication by the two parties of two opposing Confessions of Faith—of date 1611 and 1612—one of which contains one hundred Articles, and the other covers four-and-forty pages) compelled other Separatists to repel the charge of Anabaptism and Familism, and like heresies then odious, by the public setting forth of the views which they themselves actually entertained.

In this connection two principles, held by our fathers to be fundamental, claim consideration.

One was, that except as modified, in part, in the case of the children of the Covenant, only those should be admitted to be church-members, who give reasonable evidence of being real Christians. No one will doubt that John Robinson fairly expressed the Puritan conviction of his day, when he said [*Just and Necessarie Apologie*, 60; cf. *Religious Communion*, 17]: "Do, or can the gracious promises of God made to the Church, the heavenly blessings due to the Church, the seales of divine grace given to the Church, appertain to other then such?" [i.e., "spiritual persons;" and, in his *Catechism*, "affirmed that the Church must consist of faithfull and holy persons" [1].

The other was, that, as the rule, the intelligent acceptance of true doctrine is an essential evidence of piety. Thus John Cotton said [*Holinesse of Ch'ch Members*, 19]:

Ignorant persons (grossly ignorant) of the first principles, and foundations of Religion, are not to be received members into the Church . . . for such cannot make profession of their faith, which they know not . . . Atheists, Witches, Papists, and all Hereticks, who either deny the faith, or professe a false faith against the foundation of Christian Religion, they are not to be received . . . for such professe not the faith of Christ, but either no faith, or a false faith.

While, then, our fathers might not undertake to say that a man could not be saved whose views were erroneous, provided, in however imperfect a degree, he were in the exercise of sincere faith; they were, nevertheless, earnestly convinced that false views are, usually, evidence of a perverse will or guilty affections, more than of unsound

judgment. And at all events they did not feel that a person who denied any of the doctrines which they usually held—waiving the question of the possibility of his salvation—was calculated to be useful as a Church-member. There is plenty of evidence that this view ruled in regard to questions as remote from the centre of theology as Infant Baptism; and they surely never could have regarded the man who denied the divinity of Christ, the eternity of the future punishment of the persistently impenitent, or the doctrine of election, as being so in a state of grace as to warrant his admission to the Church as one of the “faithful.” It will not do to carry back to their times loose notions which now prevail as to the relation of belief to life. Those notions were unknown, and would have been excessively offensive, to them. It had been one clause of the Athanasian Creed into which for ages the Christian Church had been drilled, that except one “do keep whole and undefiled” the Catholic faith, “without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.” Nor had the Puritans in any wise fallen from the grace of this view. Nicholas Byfield, prominent among them, in 1618, published *The Principles*. . . *A Collection of such Truths as are of necessity to be believed unto Salvation*. The work contains 408 pages, besides that *The Sum of the Principles* at the end takes three-and-twenty more—all of which, he explains to the Countess of Northumberland in his dedication, is “*absolutely necessary to be known [and, of course, to be believed] of as many as are to be saved*” [4].

There is, then, this unvarying background of the Calvinistic theology—Dr. Schaff justly says that the Puritans were *High Calvinists*—essentially as it framed itself to expression a few years later, in the Westminster Confession in 1647, and in the Savoy Declaration in 1658, to be had in perpetual remembrance as toning the light and shade of every true theological picture of those days. Whether a church established under such auspices had separate Articles of Faith, or did not have them, its members looked to be assured of the vital godliness of candidates for admission to the irnumber; and, at a time when the First Church of Boston excommunicated a sister who stayed away from Sunday service because she did not like the preaching [*Ellis's First Ch'h. Boston*, 20], and the First Church in Dedham declined to receive Thomas Morse, because he “was thought by y^e company to be so darke & unsatisfying in respect of y^e worke of grace, that, though his life was innocent in respect of men, yet they had not

grounds to imbrace him” [*Dedham Church Records*, 6], and the Church in Wenham scrupled to take in Goody Shiply on account of “Sluttry, & y^e rudenes & incivility of her children” [*Mss. Records*, 59], would have been about as likely to discover satisfying evidence of such fitness in one who avowed a doubt or confessed a hesitancy concerning anything in that marvellous system of doctrine, as the citizens of Savannah would have been to erect a statue in honor of Wendell Phillips in the pre-Rebellion era.

We have need only to remember that the theology which was in the air that was from childhood breathed by the men who settled New England was thoroughly Calvinistic, to comprehend how natural and almost inevitable it was that they should hold those views. What is known as the Genevan Bible was first printed at Geneva in 1560. It was the result of the labors of English exiles harbored there from the persecuting hand of Bloody Mary; and though it never gained formal sanction from Monarch, Parliament, or Convocation, it went almost immediately into use in many English churches, and became the most approved version in the homes of England from 1560 to 1630. It was even more popular in Scotland, exceeding all other translations together. It is believed that as many as two hundred distinct editions were printed within three-quarters of a century; King James's version, in 1611, only slowly displacing it. Now those who are familiar with this “Breeches” Bible know that its translators, in their preface [iii.], said:

Considering how hard a thing it is to vnderstand the holy Scriptures, and what errors, sects and heresies grow dayly for lacke of the true knowledge thereof, & how many are discouraged (as they pretend) because they cannot attaine to the true and simple meaning of the same, we haue also inducured both by the diligent reading of the best cōmentaries, and also by the conference with the godly and learned brethren, to gather briefe annotations vpon all the hard places aswel for the vnderstanding of such words as are obscure, and for the declaration of the text, as for the application of the same, as may most appertain to Gods glory & the edification of his Church.

Nor does it need to be said further, that these brief marginal notes are saturated with condensed Calvinism. To take a very few samples:

Marg. note on Deut. ii. 30: God in his election and reprobation doeth not onely appoint the endes, but the meanes tending to the same.

Marg. note, Ruth i. 15: No perswasions can preuaile to turne them backe from God, whom he hath chosen to be his.

Marg. note, Ezek. xxiii. 23: Albeit God in his eternall counsell appointed the death and damnation of the reprobate, yet the ende of his counsell

was not their death onely, but chiefly his own glorie. And also because he doeth not approue sinne, therefore it is here sayd that he would have them to turne away from it that they might liue.

Marg. note, Rom. ii. 11: As the potter before he make his vessel, he doth appoynt some to glorie and others to ignominie.

Marg. note, Rom. ix. 15: As the onely will and purpose of God is the chiefe cause of election, and reprobation, so his free mercie in Christ is an inferior cause of saluation, and the hardening of the heart an inferior cause of damnation.

To this Bible thus marginally interpreted in the direction of Calvinism, were added in 1579 three leaves of unknown authorship, inserted between the Old and New Testaments. The first contains a brief "Summe of the Whole Scripture of the Bookes of the Olde and Newe Testament," whose general tenor corresponds to the theology of the annotations. The second and third contain *Certaine questions and answers touching the doctrine of Predestination, the vse of Gods worde and Sacraments*. The first four of these will indicate what was then understood to be the right spiritual training for the rising generations [p. 437]:

Question: Why doe men so much varie in matters of religion?

Answer: Because all haue not the like measure of knowledge, neither doe all beleue y^e Gospel of Christ.

Q.: What is the reason thereof?

A.: Because they onely beleue the Gospell and doctrine of Christ, which are ordained vnto eternall life.

Q.: Are not all ordained vnto eternall life?

A.: Some are vessels of wrath ordained vnto destruction, as others are vessels of mercie prepared to glory.

Q.: Howe standeth it with Gods iustice, that some are appointed vnto damnation?

A.: Very wel: because all men haue in themselves sinne, which deserveth no lesse: and therefore the mercie of God is wonderfull in that he vouchsafeth to saue some of that sinfull race, and to bring them to the knowledge of the trueth.

These "questions and answers" appear to form a part of every quarto edition of the Geneva Bible printed by the King's or Queen's printer, from 1579 to 1615 inclusive—disappearing precisely when Archbishop Laud began to show himself as a force in ecclesiastical affairs. They have been called: "the most clear and naked exposition of Calvinistic doctrine that can be seen compressed into a small space," and it has been also said that their nearly universal family use will "go far to account for the almost uniformly Calvinistic tone of all English divinity during the time of Elizabeth and James I." [*Saturday Review*, 25 September, 1880.]

If we come closer home to our fathers we shall find abundant evidence of their entire

sympathy with even the most extreme positions of Calvinism. No man was more popular with them than the celebrated William Perkins, lecturer at Great St. Andrew's, Cambridge. In 1591 he published "The foundation of Christian Religion: gathered into Six principles," etc., which John Robinson seems to have republished with his own *Catechism* as an appendix—indorsing it as containing the very marrow of true divinity. The second principle, viz.: "All men are wholly corrupted with sin through Adams fall, & so are become slaues of Sathan, and guiltie of eternall damnation," sufficiently sets forth its doctrinal quality. No intelligent person can candidly read the books of John Robinson without conceding that he was not only himself a thorough Calvinist, and regarded that high Calvinism which was formulated by the Synod of Dort as the truth of God; but that he fully shared that estimate of its ultimate quality as the theology of the future inexpressed to essential modification, which was common to those good men of the time who sympathized with that deliverance. He hesitated not to stigmatize [*Defence of Doctrine of Synode at Dort*, 32] as "fleshly reason," any view of God's relation to evil which would reduce it from "powerfull work" to "bare sufferance." He made no scruple of declaring [*Ibid.*, 139], that "infants bring sin properly into the world with them." And his rule of interpreting the Bible was [*Observations, Divine and Morall*, etc., 77]: "Faith, if it be not grounded upon God's Word, is fancie; if it receav not the same Word in everie part, but where it lists, it is sawsnesse." It is an illogical and every way unwarrantable perversion of a single paragraph of his famous "Farewell Address" to the departing Pilgrims, which has led to his being claimed as the apostle and prophet of modern Liberalism. The only extant original account of that address was preserved by Edward Winslow, and was first printed by him—a quarter of a century after the event—in his *Hypocrisie Vnmasked* (1646); a book which soon so went out of circulation that only half a dozen copies, or so, are now known. In the early days of the "Liberal" movement in Massachusetts, some unscrupulous, or not over-careful, writer, cited from it a sentence or two [97] to the effect that: "if God should reveal anything by any other instrument of his, to be as ready to receive it as ever we were to receive any truth by his Ministry: For he was very confident the Lord had more truth and light yet to breake forth out of his holy Word," etc.; and claimed that in that language he

refer
origi
uncl
son t
not t
an a
only
quie
Jo
of th
Robi
and
peop
late
Kea
thas
No
the e
ix: 2
in y
The
to ac
& al
God,
not f
thou
N
is si
up o
and
chu
evid
who
and
fait
ever
helo
Elec
Sain
the
pen
I
sure
lati
Eng
An
bein
be
rule
mu
pla
om
rea
sion
acc
eld
[30
pro
up
wh
fro
ref

referred to *doctrine*. A close study of the original, however, makes it as clear as the unclouded noonday sun, that what Robinson then had in mind was *church polity*, and not *theological opinion*. It has its place in an argument and not in a narrative, and its only possible argumentative pertinence requires that it be interpreted as I suggest.

John Cotton was as fair a representative of the Puritans of Massachusetts as John Robinson was of the Pilgrims of Plymouth, and we find John Cotton preaching to his people of the First Church in Boston, as late as February 7, 1655 [*Ms. notes of Robert Keayne in my possession*], on Eph. iii. 11, thus :

Nothing falls out by chance, but according to the eternal purpose & counsell of God. 2 Kings ix: 26. Jehu doeth what God hath apointed, y^e in y^e very plot of ground Joram shall be slayne. The chariots & fecte of y^e horses & all are guided to accomplish y^e will of God. Sicknes & death & all such act according to y^e will & purpose of God. There is no chance here. A sparowe cannot fall to y^e ground but as God purposeth. The thoughts of God shall take place.

Now the question which confronts us here is simply whether, in a community brought up on the Genevan Bible, and its Catechism, and indoctrinated by such preachers, the churches were likely expressly to repudiate evidence of sound doctrinal belief in those who asked admission to their membership ; and to been tirely satisfied if they avowed faith in Christ as a personal Saviour, without even so much as asking them whether they held to Infant Baptism, or the doctrine of Election, or of the Perseverance of the Saints, or of the Divinity of Christ, or of the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent ?

I concede, at once, that, under the pressure of the times, and of their own past relation to the set formulæ of the Church of England, they would draw back—as the *Answer of the Elders* frankly says [63]—being “doubtfull whether such platformes be expedient as are imposed as a binding” rule of faith and practice, “so that all men must believe and walke according to that platforme, without adding, altering, or omitting.” At the same time they saw “no reason to condemne or disallow” a “confession of Faith of the holy doctrine which is according to godlinesse ;” and these same elders, in another part of the same *Answer* [30] declare that they require “personall profession of their faith” as well as entrance upon Church Covenant, of all applicants, whether coming from another church or from the world ; and justify the practice by reference to the custom of the Reformed

churches, as stated by Robert Parker [*De Politeia Eccles.*, etc., iii. 171], who declares that no man was admitted to them who did not *aperte profiteatur se doctrinam nostræ ecclesiæ suscipere*. And, among a people where a religious person who differed essentially from the regnant faith, illustrated Juvenal's :

Rara avis in terris, nigroque similillima cygno,

no doubt churches might be safely constituted and long continued, without set Articles of Faith, because that doctrinal conformity which in all cases was assumed, became sufficiently manifested through that written, or spoken, relation of religious experience which was an invariable prerequisite proof of the godly worthiness of every candidate. Many such relations survive to our time in the careful files of some of our ancient churches, and upon the pages of those Church records where they were spread ; and their strong flavor of Calvinistic doctrine is usually as unmistakable as rose fragrance is apt to be in June gardens. The early Christianity of New England, however, soon experienced the same assault to which Nonconformity and Separatism had always been exposed ; being attacked with allegations of heresy. It was said that the world did not know what they believed, and the old principle voiced by Tacitus was in their case perverted into omne ignotum pro *malefico*. To defend themselves against this, in September, 1648—less than twenty years after the Massachusetts Colony came over, and less than thirty after the Plymouth Colony was founded—a Synod was convoked at Cambridge, which, by “a most unanimous vote,” adopted the Westminster Confession, then damp from its first complete issue in London, as “very Holy, Orthodox and Judicious, in all Matters of Faith,” and commended it as worthy of consideration and acceptance. And this same Synod frankly said [*Magnalia*, v. 3] :

they hoped, that this Proof of them being *Fellow Heirs of the same Common Salvation*, with the Churches beyond Sea, would not only free them from the Suspicion of *Heresie*, but clear them from the Character of *Schism* also ; in as much as their Dissent from those Churches, was now evidently but in some lesser Matters of *Ecclesiastical Polity* ; and a Dissent not managed either with such *Arrogancy* or *Censoriousness*, as are the Essential Properties of *Schismatics*.

Cotton Mather, whose personal memory ran back through thirty of the fifty, and who, through his great father Increase, and his possibly greater grandfather Richard, had been a most important part of the history of that period—writing within fifty

years of this action—declares [*Magnalia*, v. 3] that the early New English churches “desired most particularly to maintain the Faith professed by the Churches of Old England, the country whereto was owing their Original.” He goes on to say :

Few Pastors of Mankind ever took such pains at Catechising, as have been taken by our New-English Divines : Now let any Man living read the most judicious and elaborate Catechisms published : a lesser and a larger by Mr. Norton, a lesser and a larger by Mr. Mather, several by Mr. Cotton, one by Mr. Davenport, one by Mr. Stone, one by Mr. Norris, one by Mr. Noyes, one by Mr. Fisk, several by Mr. Eliot, one by Mr. Sea-born Cotton, a large one by Mr. Fitch ; and say, whether true Divinity were ever better handled ; or, whether they were not the truest Sons of the Church of England, who thus maintained its Fundamental Articles, which are so many of them first subscribed, and then deneyed and confuted by some that would monopolize that Name unto themselves.

Further, we must remember that the early days of New England were saddened and imbibited by a terrible doctrinal controversy, when the invasion of Antinomianism in the person of Mrs. Hutchinson and Mr. Wheelwright, almost wrecked the First Church of Boston, and came near to shattering the influence of John Cotton himself ; the raging fires of its excitement being only quenched by the Synod of 1637, which formally condemned eighty-two errors as contrary to Scripture, dangerous to the Church, and perilous to salvation. These experiences not unnaturally awakened a solicitude which tended to exaggerate in the public mind the importance of every, even the slightest, deviation from the established creed. Deputy-Governor Thomas Dudley voiced the public feeling as to this, when, in 1638 [4 *Mass. Hist. Coll.* vii. 112], he wrote to Governor Winthrop :

Nowe seeing that this is the way Sathan invades us by (viz. new opynions & heresyes) it behooves vs to be the more vigilant, & to stirr vpp our zeale, & stopp breaches at the beginninge, least forbeareance hurt vs as it did before.

Now, to take evidence upon the exact question before us, I will first adduce proof of complaints made at the time, of the excessive severity used in the matter of the admission of members to the churches in the earliest years of New England. In 1637 Rev. R. Stansby, of Little Waldingfield, Suffolk, wrote to Rev. John Wilson, pastor of the First Church in Boston, specifying as one serious difficulty in the minds of the friends of the cause in England [4 *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, vii. 11] :

That you are so strict in admission of members to your church, that more then one halfe are out of your church in all your congregations, & that

Mr. Hoker before he went away preached against yt (as one report who hard him) (& he saith) now although I knowe all must not be admytted, yet this may do much hurt, yf one come amongst you of another minde, & they should joyne with hym. . . . Ther is now so much talke of yt, & such certeyne truth of yt, & I know many of worth, for outward estate & ability, for wisdom & grace, are much danted from coming.

Richard Bernard, of Batcombe, in the same year [cited in *Dr. Fell's Reply to Hon. D. A. White*, 7] said of the New England churches :

They propound questions to be answered by such as come to be admitted into their Church fellowship : as about the Godhead, the Trinity, their works, man's first estate in Innocence, the Fall, the Redemption, Christ, His Nature, His Offices, Faith, the Sacraments, the Church, the Resurrection, and the Last Judgment.

Thomas Lechford, a lawyer of Clement's Inn, who spent the years 1638–40 in New England, and who lacked neither inquisitiveness to gather nor intelligence to comprehend facts, himself desired admission to the Church in Boston, but was denied, as Mr. Cotton [*Way of Cong. Ch'h's Cleared*, i. 71] says :

For his professed errors : as (1) That the Antichrist described in the Revelation was not yet come, nor any part of that Prophecie yet fulfilled from the 4. Chapter to the end ; (2) That the Apostolick function was not yet ceased : but that there still ought to be such, who should by their transcendent authority govern al Churches. To reclaim him from these Errors, he was seriously dealt withall both in conference, and (according to his desire) in writing.

Lechford pleaded that his opinion on these two points “might be held, or not held, *salva fide*,” and ought not to debar him from Church fellowship. But the Church could not see it in that light, and kept him out. In 1641 he went back to England, and the next year published his *Plain Dealing : or, Newes from New England*, in which [73] he said of the New England churches :

They hold their Covenant constitutes their Church, and that implies, we that come to joyne with them were not members of any true Church whence we came, and that I dare not professe. Again, here is required such confessions and professions, both in private and publique, both by men and women, before they be admitted, that three parts of the people of the Country remaine out of the Church, so that in short time most of the people will remaine unbaptized, if this course hold.

And so [*Transactions of Am. Antiqⁿ Soc.*, vii. 274] in his *Note-Book* he says :

The people here, in short time, if the course here hold long, (which God forbid !) are like to be most unchristian, and the rest erroneous and ignorant enough : I have not received the Sacrament these two yeares, nor am yet like to doe.

In 1645 Robert Baylie, of Glasgow, published his *Dissuasive From the Errours of the Time*, in which [22] he described the New England churches as requiring a candidate to be "most Orthodox," yet not accounting him for that :

qualified to be a Church-member, except he declare publicly in the face of the Congregation, such clear and certain signes of his real Sanctification and true Regeneration, as gives full satisfaction, not onely to the Minister and Elders, and many of the people, but to all and every one, or at least the major part of the Church.

What, if anything, among his voluminous publications, does John Cotton say upon the question under consideration ?

His earliest printed utterance was perhaps in his *Questions and Answers upon Church Government* (1634), thus [23] :

Q. What manner of men are they whom God hath appointed to be received as Brethren and Members of the Church ?

A. Such as are Called of God out of the World, unto the Fellowship of Jesus Christ ; and do willingly offer and joyn themselves, first to the Lord, and then to the Church, by Confession of their sins, by Profession of their Faith, and by laying hold of his Covenant.

A second was, in 1641, in *Questions Propounded to such as are Admitted to the Church Fellowship*, etc. [5] where he says :

They [candidates] make a brief confession, or else an answer to a few questions about the maine fundamentall points of Religion, that it may appeare indeed whether they be competently endued with the knowledge of the truth, and sound in the faith, and about the Godhead, the Trinity, the worke, our first estate of innocency, the Fall, our Redemption, Christ his Nature, his Offices, Faith, the Sacraments, the Church, the Resurrection, the last Judgment, *such as every Christian man is bound to learne, and give account of.*

Next I note his *Doctrine of the Church* (1643) in which [4] he repeats the testimony already first cited. Next comes his famous *Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven* (1644), etc., in which [7] he says :

The key of faith is common to all beleevers. A faithfull soule knowing the Scriptures, and Christ in them, receiveth Christ, and entreth through him into the kingdome of heaven, both here, and hereafter. Here he entreth into a state of grace through faith, and, *by the profession of his faith*, he entreth also into the fellowship of the Church, etc.

In his *Holinesse of Church Members* (1650), he says [14] that to join the Church it is only necessary "that they *professe the sound faith*," and crave fellowship. And again [20] he says :

Atheists, Witches, Papists, and all Hereticks, who either deny the faith, or professe a false faith against the foundation of Christian Religion, they are not to be received members into the fellowship of the Church, without repentance and reforma-

tion. For such professe not the faith of Christ, but either no faith, or a false faith.

Most conclusive of all, however, is his little tract entitled *Mr. John Cotton, of Boston in New England, his Twelve Fundamental Articles of Christian Religion : the Denial whereof . . . makes a man an Heretick*. These twelve are : (1) the Trinity ; (2) that God made, governs, and rewards ; (3) that God alone is to be worshipped ; (4) according to his written Word ; (5) the fall and consequent guilt of man ; (6) man's inability ; (7) the Redemption of Christ ; (8) freely given to every believer ; (9) whom the Lord calls he justifies ; (10) he who is justified is regenerated ; (11) yet is imperfect ; (12) the Resurrection, the judgment and eternal rewards and punishments. He then goes on [8] :

Put all these things together, and you have all the necessary Points of Christian Religion ; which whoso obstinately opposeth, or is ignorant of, he cannot be found in a state of Grace that accompanies salvation. This is the Summe of the Articles ; and he that overthrowes any one of these, and obstinately persisteth therein, brings himself to Eternal Damnation.

In 1644 W. Rathband printed *A Briefe Narration of Some Church Courses Held in Opinion and Practise in the Churches lately erected in New England*, in which [8] he said :

They [the N. E. Churches] examine them [candidates for admission] touching their knowledge in the Principles of Religion.

Later in the same year Thomas Weld, of Roxbury, replied by *An Answer to W. R. his Narration . . . Vindicating those Godly and Orthodoxall Churches from more then an Hundred Imputations*, etc., yet so far from denying the truth of what Rathband had said upon the point before us, he justified the course alleged to be taken, saying [22] :

Many, for want of examination of themselves and tryall by others, that went in common view for sound ones, possibly (and that not without good cause) upon due triall may be found too light when weighed in Gods ballance, and its better for such to be discovered here, then hereafter, to their eternall ruine.

I have already referred to the *Answer of the Elders* (1643), but it should be cited again. A part of the eighth question sent over was [2] :

Whether doe you require of all persons of age, whom you admit Members of any Church, a publique profession of their faith concerning the Articles of Religion ?

To this the elders of the Bay replied, in part, as follows [23] :

We count it our duty to use all lawfull and convenient meanes, whereby God may helpe us to discern, whether those that offer themselves for Church Members, be persons so qualified or no: and therefore first we heare them speake concerning the Gift and Grace of Justifying Faith in their soules, and the manner of Gods dealing with them in working it in their hearts. . . . Secondly, *we heare them speake what they do believe concerning the Doctrine of Faith*, so taking a tryall what measure they have of the good knowledge of the Lord, as knowing that without knowledge men cannot well Examine themselves and discern the Lords body, as Church Members ought to doe when they come to the Lords Table. And hereby also *we would prevent* (as the Lord shall helpe us) the *creeping in of any into the Church that may be infected with corrupt opinions of Arminianisme, Familisme, etc.*, or any other dangerous error against that faith which was once delivered to the Saints, as knowing how easily such men if they were admitted, might infect others, and perhaps destroy the Faith of some.

Surely it might be difficult to excel this last clause in suggesting the precautionary and protective functions of a creed, as understood and employed in the practice of our own day.

Thomas Hooker [*Survey of the Summe of Church-Discipline*, 1648] insists, on the one hand [24], that a suitable candidate for Church-membership must "have such a measure of knowledge as may in reason let in Christ into the soul, and carry the soul to him," and, on the other [26], that "there is an Ignorance, that will keep a man from being a member of a true Church; and there is no point more fundamentall, then Christ to be the foundation stone, laid by God, whereon our faith, and we, must be built."

In 1644 Gulielmus Apollonius, pastor of the Church of Middelberg, in Zeeland, sent over sixteen questions for answer, and John Norton—then of Ipswich and afterward John Cotton's successor with the First Church in Boston—was selected to reply to them, which he did in the first Latin volume produced on this side of the sea—*Responsio ad Totam Questionum Syllogem à Clar. Viro Dom. G. A. Eccles. Mid. Past. propositam*, etc., 1648. The first question respected the qualifications of Church-members, and [3] to this Norton replies:

A mundo sit segregatus, scientiâ Dei & verâ religione, professione nominis Christi, & in externâ conversatione puritatis donis absque scandalo sit ornatus.

Soon after John Davenport had become, in 1639, the pastor of the Church in *Quinnipiac*, he wrote a short treatise on the New England Church way, which, on its voyage to the press in London, "perished in the rude Waves of the vast Ocean, with some

other excellent Manuscripts and precious Christians." Seven or eight years after "God set him about it again," and he re-wrote his Tractate. But it did not get itself printed until another score of years had passed, and its gifted author had removed to Boston and had been buried in John Cotton's tomb. In that "short and nervous Treatise" [*The Power of Congregational Churches Asserted and Vindicated*, etc., 1672] he [10] phrased it thus:

It is the will and appointment of Christ, that all and only such grown persons be admitted Members of particular Churches, who make such a publick profession of their Faith, as the Church may, in charitable discretion conceive hath blessedness annexed to it, and is such as flesh and blood hath not revealed to a man, but our Heavenly Father.

It ought not to be forgotten in this connection that when [June 28, 1662] Charles II. issued his famous letter "to the Massachusetts," designed materially to enlarge the privileges of a portion of the people, by requiring that "all freeholders of competent estates, not vicious in conversations" be allowed to vote; even he was careful to add [*Hutchinson Papers*, 379] that they must be "Orthodox in religion—though of different perswasions concerning church-government."

We have two accounts of what took place at Dorchester in April and August, 1636; both of which are explicit as to the point of confession of faith, and both of which illustrate the exceeding care then taken in the formation of churches. One is in *Winthrop's Journal* [i. 218], the other in *The Life and Death of Mr. Richd Mather* [75]:

Winthrop.
Mr. Mather, and others of Dorchester, intending to begin a new church there, (a great part of the old one being gone to Connecticut) desired the approbation of the other Churches, and of the magistrates; and, accordingly, they assembled this day, and, after some of them had given proof of their gifts, they made confession of their faith, which was approved of; but proceeding to manifest the work of God's grace in themselves, the Churches by their elders, and the magistrates, etc. thought them not meet, at present, to be the foundation of a Church; and thereupon they were content to forbear to join till further consideration.

Mather.
There was an *Essay* towards Gathering a Church April 1. 1636; but by reason that the Messengers of Neighbour-Churches were not satisfied, concerning some that were intended Members of that Foundation, the work was deferred untill August 23, when a Church was Constituted in Dorchester according to the Order of the Gospels by *Confession and Profession of Faith*; and Mr. Mather was chosen *Teacher* of that Church.

When, in due process of time, John Eliot began to think his Christian Indians fit to be organized into a Church estate, it is remarkable what pains he took to give assurance of their soundness in the faith, and how patiently he waited to know what was thought in England of their individual Confessions; and, in regard of the difficulty of the work, how it was finally arranged [*Life*

of John Eliot, 193] that "some one of them should make a *Doctrinall Confession* before the Lord and His people, as the rule of faith which they build upon, the rest attesting their consent unto the same."

Cotton Mather, perhaps, is the last witness whom I have need to cite. In that ponderous *Magnalia*, which, with all its whimsicalities, sustains so large and vital a relation to the annals of New England, that if all copies of it were suddenly to be blanchied into white paper, it would be almost impossible to recover our ecclesiastical history, he recurs repeatedly to the point before us. He says [v. 4] :

It is true, that particular Churches in the Country have had their *Confessions* by themselves drawn up in their own Form ; nor indeed were the Symbols in the most primitive Times always delivered in *ipsissimis verbis*. It is also true that few *Learned Men* have been admitted as Members of our Churches, but what have at their *Admissions*, entertained them with notable *Confessions* of their own composing, insomuch that if the *Protestants* have been by the *Papists* called *Confessionists*, the *Protestants* of *New-England*, have, of all, given the most laudable occasion to be called so. Nevertheless, all this *Variety* has been the exactest *Unity* ; all those *Confessions* have been but so many *Derivations* from, and *Explications* and *Confirmations* of, that *Confession*, which the *Synods* had voted for them all ; for, *ut plures Riculi, ab uno Fonte, ita plures Fidei Confessiones ab una eademque Fidei Veritate, Manare possunt*.

In 1690, Presbyterians and Congregationalists in England adopted certain *Heads of Agreement*, which the *Magnalia* [v. 59] declares to give so true a description of the New-English Church constitution, that it would be impossible to give a truer one. But those "Heads" declare [p. 2] :

That none shall be admitted as Members . . . but such persons as are *knowing, and sound in the Fundamental Doctrines* of the Christian Religion.

And, again [p. 19] :

As to what appertains to soundness of Judgment in matters of Faith, we esteem it sufficient, That a Church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God, the perfect and only Rule of Faith and Practice, and own either the *Doctrinal* part of those commonly called the *Articles of the Church of England*, or the *Confession or Catechisms, Shorter or Larger, compiled by the Assembly at Westminster*, or the *Confession agreed on at the Savoy*, to be agreeable to the said Rule.

Still again [v. 43] the *Magnalia* says :

The first churches of *New-England* began only with a *Profession of Assent and Consent* unto the *Confession of Faith*, and the *Covenant of Communion*.

And in his *Ratio Disciplina* (1726) the same writer sets it down as a usual part of their Church covenanting [?] to :

declare our serious Belief of the Christian Religion, as contained in the Sacred Scriptures, and with such a *View thereof as the Confession of Faith in our Churches* has exhibited.

It will have been noticed that, in the first of the above citations, Cotton Mather states that "particular Churches in the Country have had their *Confessions* by themselves." Of this there can be no doubt.

Secretary Morton of the Plymouth Colony [*New-Englands Memoriall*, 75] states distinctly that the first church in Salem, when gathered in 1629, had "a *Confession of Faith*, and a *Covenant*," drawn up "in Scripture language ;" and his statement is corroborated by the fact that John Higginson, pastor of the Salem Church, indorsed his narrative by a laudatory preface, and that, in 1856, the distinguished antiquary, Rev. Dr. J. B. Felt, published a copy of that original *Confession of Faith* which he had discovered.

I have made no special research to ascertain of how many of the early churches of New England this was true. But I find, on turning to the Rev. John Fiske's *MS. Records of the Church in Wenham*—a copy of which is in my possession—the following entries [pp. 8, 31, 36, 104] :

8 Nov. 1644 : Voted, that a consent & assent should be required to *y^e profession of faith of y^e church* ; and that *y^e Confession* should be read distinctly to them [candidates for admission] & time given them to returne *y^r answer*.

10 Aug. 1645 : The *Covenant* administred to her [Mary Hersey] she manifesting her assent to *y^e Church Confession of Faith*.

28 Sept. 1645 : Geo. Norton gave his assent to *Confess'n of faith*, & *y^e cov^t* administred to him.

15 Mar. 1653-4. Touching his [Bro^r Rogers] *Confession of Faith*, considering he had not viewed the book allowed by *y^e churches* [the *Westminster Confession* adopted by the Synod of 1648], & time would not permit *y^t* he should dilate himself in *y^e matters*, there was committed to him the *booke of y^e Confession of y^e Church*, to peruse, & so to give his *Assent thereunto*.

I find also in a copy which I have of the early records of the Church in Chelmsford, the following entries [pp. 59, 86, 104, 117, 152] :

16 Nov. 1660 : Voted, That tis Necessary, Regular & Orderly for *y^e Ch^h* & officers thereof (especially in these perilous times) to passe a Tryall (by requiring a *profession of their Faith* & also by a personal relation of *y^e worke of grace*) of Members dismissed to them from other churches.

16 Nov. 1662 : After silence [in the admission of Jon. Burge and Jona. Blanchard] the Officer [the pastor] proceeded & demanded of him [each] his consent to *y^e Church Confession & Covenant*, etc.

19 July, 1663 : He [John Stevens] upon Relation of *y^e Worke of Grace* on his soule, profession of his faith briefly before our hands, assent to *y^e Church^s confession*, and *Covenant & testimony* by

Bro: Hinks, Mr. Web & Dan. Blogged touching him, was admitted, etc.

5 Nov. 1665: Moses fliske, after a profession of his faith made in y^e public congregation respecting both y^e doctrine of faith, & y^e worke of faith upon his owne soule, & y^e manifestation of his approbation of & consent to y^e Confession of this Church, was received into y^e Covenant of this Church, & so into full cōmunion.

2 Feb. 1672: He [Eleazer Browne] having stood propounded 3. weekes, was this day taken into y^e Church into full fellowship: after y^e relation of y^e worke of Grace made by him, his Assent manifested to our Church Confession & Covenant, & y^e Testimony of Mr. Bulkley, Leift. Hinksman & myself [the pastor].

I see no reason to doubt that these entries fairly sample what would usually, or at least often, be found in the MS. Church Records of the first century and a half of New England, were they, in their completeness, accessible to our study.

By the evidence in this article set forth I respectfully submit that the following conclusions have been established, viz.:

1. As a whole, the early settlers of New England were Calvinists in their religious faith, after the pattern which shows itself in the Genevan Bible.
2. They regarded such doctrinal belief as an essential evidence of the possession of a truly regenerate character, with real fitness for Church-membership.
3. They therefore founded their churches explicitly, or implicitly, upon that foundation of doctrine.
4. In the earliest days of the Colonies, when almost all were of one mind in those matters, attention was directed chiefly to the Covenant, as being the *articulum stantis vel cadentis* of a particular local church organization.
5. So soon, however, as, through an attempt to fix upon them, in comparison with the Church of England, and the Reformed Churches of the Continent, the stigma of a want of orthodoxy, pressure was brought to bear from without, they formally adopted the Westminster and Savoy Symbols, as the solemn affirmation of their general religious belief, and the common doctrinal basis upon which their churches stood.
6. It was their habit to endeavor to reach an affirmative conclusion as to the spiritual soundness of applicants for admission to their communion, by receiving from them more or less elaborate relations of their religious convictions, revealing their doctrinal position, as well as their personal experiences of divine grace.
7. In addition to this many churches early took up the custom of requiring from such

candidates formal assent to the Westminster or Savoy Symbol, prior to their admission to the Covenant, and to the Communion which followed.

8. There is also the clearest proof that from the earliest days of New England, some churches—the number of which cannot be fixed—adopted for themselves Articles of Faith of their own, whose acceptance became a condition precedent to membership.

In view of all which, with the involved fact that during more than a century and three-quarters before, in 1815, that pamphlet dropped from a Boston press which is generally regarded as the first overt act and outcropping of the "Unitarian Controversy," the churches of New England had been accustomed to make what they regarded as doctrinal soundness a vital test of fitness for their membership; to urge that they "expressly repudiated" such a test, and to declare that, in the face of that controversy, under the stimulus and in the confusion of a panic, Congregationalism made the "worst blunder ever made" in adopting a creed test for its Church-membership, is to convey an impression than which one more erroneous would hardly be possible to human speech.

SOME REMARKS ON ANCIENT SYNODS.

BY REV. CANON BRIGHT, D.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, OXFORD, ENGLAND.

From *The Church Times*, London, April 11, 1890.

I UNDERSTAND that the invitation with which I have been honoured sets before me, as the subject on which I am to speak to you, "The Ancient Councils and Synods of the Church," as regarded from a standpoint purely historical. At any rate, that limitation is natural and convenient for the purpose of this evening's address. One cannot, in the time now available, attempt anything like a full account of these assemblies, and it would be equally inopportune to go into the questions which might be raised as to what is best and most effective with regard to modern synodical organisation, in view of the precedents to be found in ancient Church history; and into that other set of considerations which touch the corporate life of the Church in the apostolic age. The Council, so-called, which met in Jerusalem to settle the controversy about the

obligation of the Ceremonial Law, is an event of signal importance; but it lies, I think, outside the field within which we may station ourselves at present, although it might not be hard to show that in several cases Councils did, consciously or not, reflect some of its characteristic features.

The first set, then, of the Councils which belong to the post-apostolic Church is clustered together in the second half of the second century. We know but little about them. The Montanist movement compelled "the faithful" of the western part of Asia Minor to "*come together at many times and in many places*," in order to examine the claims made by the new "prophets." Although the document as quoted thus by Eusebius does not tell us how they met, or under whom, or by what form of proceedings, there is reason to conclude, in the words of Dr. Salmon, of Dublin, that the decision against the fanatics of Phrygia was pronounced by "*the neighbouring bishops*," who, in fact, are referred to in other fragmentary passages which Eusebius inserts into his history. Not long afterwards a very different question began to divide Churches which were entirely agreed on the articles of faith and the principles of Church order. Should Easter always begin on the 14th evening of the Jewish Paschal month, without regard to the day of the week, or should the "first day of the week" be a fixed point in the observance? A few Churches, comparatively, held the former view; the general mind of the Church—the mind of the Western Church as a whole—went the other way, and, as is well known, the Church of Rome was strong for the principle that Easter-day must always be Easter Sunday. We are told that "Synods and assemblies of bishops" were held in order to settle this point. The Bishop of Ephesus convened the bishops who were subordinate to him; and they gave sentence very determinedly, on the ground of tradition from St. John, for the "fourteenth day" standard. But Eusebius speaks of letters issued by the bishops assembled in Pontus and Palestine in the opposite sense, and implies that other synods, held at the same time, were Episcopal. It is quite accurate to say with Dr. Pusey, "Every step in settling the question, or in resisting its being settled, is spoken of as decided by bishops." But then it is manifest that the prelates, who then assembled and thus resolved, realised their position as leaders and not despots; they knew quite intimately the mind of those who ministered under them, and of those who continued in Church

fellowship under their pastorate. They carried their clergy and people with them: there was no conflict of different orders, no need for a jealous care to limit fields of action and devise checks against misuse of authority.

In the third century we hear first of a Council held at Carthage, in which the bishops of North-western Africa, under Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, declared the baptism administered by heretics to be void. Councils, involving a "*representation*," or actual presence of "*Christian body*," in the several districts, appear to have been held regularly in Greece; but we do not know more of their constitution. Two Councils were held in Arabia on different questions of doctrine. It appears that they were episcopal, but Origen, a very eminent theologian, although not a bishop, was invited to attend, and give assistance. He himself was removed from his office as catechist at Alexandria, by a Council in which presbyters took part with bishops, and soon afterwards a Council at which bishops alone were present deposed him from priesthood, which he had received without his bishop's sanction. In other countries Councils apparently episcopal approved of the severe measures taken against him, evidently with a view to the questionable character of some of his speculations.

The episcopate of St. Cyprian supplies us with information of two kinds, which, however, it is not difficult to harmonise. The biographer, who knew and honoured him, attributes to him a "tempered" combination of qualities; and this balanced and equable state of mind appears in that adjustment of practical principles of administration, whereby he maintained, on the one hand, the high authority of his office, yet, on the other hand, exercised it, so to speak, in the midst of his clergy and people. "From the outset," he says, "I determined not to do anything on my own individual judgment without the counsel of the presbyters and the concurrence of the people;" and we find him, again and again, using such phrases as, "*with the council of the many*," "*with your judgment*," "*in accordance with your opinion*." He was what men would call a "hierarch," but not in the sense of insisting on prerogative, and keeping subordinates haughtily at a distance. He ever thought of the bishop as "*in the Church*," as well as of the Church as "*in the Bishop*." The Church in each diocese, for him, was "*a flock adhering to a pastor*," but the pastor was presumed to live in and for the flock. Episcopal govern-

ment, which, apart from the true idea of Church unity, might easily become imperious, was in his hands paternal, or even fraternal. He recognised what he once calls the "majestic character" of the baptised people: he always aimed at identifying himself with the whole diocesan body of which he was the visible head. Thus, when persecution set in, and many who, in terror, or under actual pressure of physical suffering, had in various degrees compromised their Christian fidelity, and in the one significant phrase, had "lapsed," were desirous of regaining their forfeited position—in other words, when they repented of their weakness, and craved to be restored to "the peace" and fellowship of the Church—it became necessary to look carefully at their several cases. In some of these there would be more, in others less, of extenuating circumstances; each case must, therefore, be examined on its own merits, and Cyprian repeatedly and emphatically declared that, in these investigations, the opinions and testimonies of the laity should have full weight. The same method of treatment, we learn, was resolved upon by the clergy who were ruling the Roman Church in the vacancy of its see. But in regard to the conciliar action of the Church, Cyprian speaks always of episcopal assemblies, of decisions arrived at by bishops. The Council which he held in the early summer of 251 was such an assembly, though clergy, and apparently laity, were present to hear and advise; even, as in regard to the Novatian schism, a Council of sixty bishops met at Rome, attended by a yet larger number of clerics. A Council of the bishops of Africa decided in 252 that such "lapsed persons" as had continuously shown their repentance should at once be restored to Communion. When the question about recognising, or not recognising, the baptisms formerly bestowed by heretics was revived, Cyprian presided in Council after Council, thirty-two bishops in one case, seventy-one in another, eighty-seven in a third. It is certain that these assemblies were composed of bishops. The third of them is fully described in its extant acts or minutes, which begin, "*When very many bishops from the* several *provinces were assembled with the presbyters and deacons, a great part of the laity being also present, Cyprian said.*" Then, follows his opening speech to his colleagues, that is, the bishops. We see they do not by any means sit within closed doors; all is done publicly, "in the face of the Church," but still it is they who form the Synod. Each of them in turn delivers his personal

mind. Cyprian again, at the close, expresses his opinion, and with this the record concludes. Another Council was chiefly occupied with the question whether the baptism of an infant should be deferred for a week after its birth, in imitation of the whole rule about circumcision; and the unanimous judgment was "No." Another Council, not so numerous, replied to the application of some Spanish Churchmen who were scandalised and disturbed by the misconduct of two Spanish bishops, one of whom—the conciliar letter asserts—had imposed on the credulity of the Roman bishop, Stephen. Firmilian, a great Asiatic bishop, in a letter to Cyprian, refers to a previous Council at Iconium, by which the same stringent view which Cyprian held as to heretics' baptism had been formally affirmed. It need hardly be added that the milder view, maintained by the Roman bishop as against the African Church, has prevailed in Western Christendom.

A very important and interesting Council, or, rather, series of Councils, was held in regard to the heresy of Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, who maintained, although with a great fertility in shifty and illusory explanations, that the Word was an impersonal power or Divine attribute, and that Jesus Christ was a mere man, on whom that power had rested with exceptional fullness, and who, for his remarkable "advance" in wisdom and goodness had received the title of "Son of God." Eusebius repeats the names of several eminent bishops, who came, "*with priests and deacons,*" to Antioch, where a Council was to be assembled. Twice the Council had met, or, if we prefer to say so, two Councils had been held, before it was ascertained that Paul's professions, which at first sight seemed satisfactory, were not really to be relied upon—that the mischief had not been stayed. The third assembly took place in 269. Malchion, who took the main part in the final discussions, was not a bishop, but a presbyter. He had formerly been head of a Greek school of logic, and, as a skilful arguer, was put forward, in the quaint phrase of an excellent writer on Early Church biography, to grasp "this slippery eel." We have a fragment of what he said, after pursuing Paul through various evasions—"Did not I long ago say that you do not admit that the Only Begotten Son, who existed before all creation, was essentially present in the Saviour?" Paul was finally condemned and deposed; and the Council put forth a formal letter, which ran in the names of sixteen persons, Malchion among

them, "*and all the others who are with us, inhabiting the neighbouring cities and nations,—bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, and the Churches of God,—to our fellow-ministers, bishops, presbyters, and deacons. and to the whole Catholic Church under heaven.*" Yet the bishops alone were deemed the constituent members of the Council. So Athanasius speaks in the next century, so Eusebius expressly tells us, "*The Shepherds,*" by which, as his context shows, he means the chief pastors, "*who were assembled, by common consent, addressed a letter to the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria, and circulated it among the provinces.*" Malchion's name appears distinctively among other names, because of the services which he had rendered; and "priests and deacons" are mentioned as classes, among those who send the letter; and so are the "churches," a phrase which, of course, refers inclusively to the laity. But as the laity did not, according to evidence, take any part in the Council, so the clergy present with their bishops are not proved, by this reference, to have been really members of the assembly in the proper sense of the term; and Malchion himself might well be present, and be employed as a theological controversialist, and named with honour in consequence, without its being intended to represent him as possessing what is technically called a "decisive vote." We must always remember, in regard to these cases, what has been observed already as to St. Cyprian, how closely the bishops, as a rule, were "in touch" with their clergy and their people. There was a deeply felt unity of interest and endeavour; the bishops, elected by clergy and people, could well represent them in Synod, and, both in and out of Synod, were accustomed, as a matter of course, to take them into confidence, and to profit by their counsel.

We now come to the great age of Councils. At the opening of the fourth century a Spanish Synod met at Eliberis, or Elvira, to draw up rules of discipline. It was composed of nineteen bishops; but twenty-six presbyters also "*were seated,*" and deacons and the laity of the place were present "*standing,*" but the canons are introduced by the words "*the bishops said.*" So, at the great Council of Arles in 314, which St. Augustine calls a "plenary" Council, and which is of special interest to us, because three bishops from our own island (those of York, London, and probably of Lincoln) came thither to represent the British Church, it appears from the documents that the bishops, properly speaking, formed the

Council. This is evidently the view which Augustine took of it. The bishops were accompanied by clergy; thus we find the names of a priest and a deacon in attendance on the British bishops; and the Emperor Constantine had expressly desired the bishops to bring with them respectively *two of the second order*. In the East, two Councils were held in this same year at Ancyra and Neocæsarea, for disciplinary legislation. They were composed of eighteen and nineteen bishops. In Egypt, Meletius is said to have been deposed by the Archbishop of Alexandria in a Council of bishops. When Licinius entered on his policy of harassing the Christians under his rule, he forbade their bishops to hold Synods; and this, says Eusebius in memorable words, was to forbid them to observe "*the sacred rules of the Church, for it was not possible to settle questions of great importance otherwise than by Synods.*" When Arianism began to trouble the Church, Archbishop Alexander, of Alexandria, in the first instance took counsel with his clergy. He caused them to sign a letter of remonstrance addressed by him to the adherents of Arius. (I need not remind any one present that the essence of Arianism consisted in these three propositions: That the Son of God was *not* eternal, that He was *not* uncreated, and that, therefore, He was external to the Divine essence, which, as such, is eternal and uncreated. He was then, in the Arian view, reduced to the position of the eldest and greatest of all creatures.) Finding the Arian party resolute, Alexander summoned a Council of all the bishops who were subordinate to his great see, and there a sentence of excommunication was passed against Arius and his followers, and he drew up, apparently with the help of Athanasius, then his deacon and secretary, an encyclical, which he sent to his "*fellow ministers,*" i.e., fellow bishops "*of the Catholic Church in every place;*" and, again assembling his own clergy, he obtained their assent and concurrence, attested by their signatures. But, as is well known, these local measures proved insufficient; the movement of heresy spread, and the first General Council was assembled at Nicæa, primarily for the purpose of dealing with Arianism, although the question of the right time for Easter, and the purely Egyptian question of the Meletian schism, were also brought before it. The summoning power, so to speak, was the Emperor Constantine's. The Bishop of Rome was represented by deputies, or delegates, but they did not preside. The presiding bishop was

the Emperor's chief religious adviser, the venerable Bishop Hosius, of Cordova; and the statement that he presided under commission from Pope Sylvester is unsupported by contemporary evidence, and has grown out of a falsification of Eusebius' words, which was adopted by a writer of the fifth century. In the preliminary discussions (as we gather from the documents) not only Christian laymen, but non-Christian philosophers, so-called, took part. In the actual conciliar proceedings Athanasius, then only a deacon, is known to have spoken with great effect. He was present as a theological adviser to his own bishop, on the same footing on which Malchion had been present and had been argumentatively prominent in the Council of Antioch. But the constituent members of this great Council, as of all the great ancient general and provincial Councils, were *bishops and bishops only*. It was long known as the "assembly of the 318"—the bishops being popularly reckoned as of that number. The formal epistle ran in the name of "*the bishops assembled at Nicaea*." A word must be said as to the part taken by the Emperor. It would be a great mistake to suppose that he was either a constituent part of the Council, or that he attended as representing the laity of the Church. He addressed the Council as the sovereign of the empire, who, as in a certain sense a disciple of Christ, was interested in the unity and good order of the Christian body, but he was not, as yet, even a member of the Church, for he was not baptised until overtaken by his last illness, in 337. At an Arian Synod, held at Antioch about 330, laymen were apparently present, but their presence proves nothing as to their relation to the Synod properly so called. The like may be said of a Council at Tyre, which was dominated by the enemies of St. Athanasius. The Council regarded itself, and was regarded by Constantine, as an assembly of Bishops. The Great Western Council of Sardica, which is now referred, not, as formerly, to 347, but to 343, accepted the testimony of laymen as to Arian deeds of violence and injustice. At Milan, in 355, a Council met, which was terrorised by the Arian Emperor Constantius. It seems to have been held in the inner part of the great church; the laity, who were in the nave, became cognisant of what was going on behind the screen or curtain of the chancel. At Ariminum, in 359, laymen, "in words" made their sentiments known to the Council. One may, for convenience, pass over a number of Arianising Councils held at Antioch, Sirmium, Ancyra, Seleucia, and else-

where; together with others on the Catholic side, for instance at Paris. At a Council of Alexandria, in 362—a Council eminent for its considerate equitableness, and its peace-making zeal—clerics were present as representing their absent Bishops; and certain monks, whom we may presume to have been laymen, were sent by their bishop, Apollinaris—then supposed to be developing a heterodox theory of the Incarnation—to explain his views.

The second (Ecumenical Council met at Constantinople in 381, under the summons of the Emperor Theodosius I., in order to establish religious unity in the East, to reaffirm Catholic doctrine, and to repress a variety of unsound theories. It was composed of 150 Bishops, not one of whom represented any Western Church, so that the see of Rome stood quite apart from its proceedings, and its claim to be ecumenical resulted from the acceptance ultimately given to that recension of the Nicene Creed, which was called after its name. About the same time an Italian Council met at Aquileia, for the purpose of dealing with two clever and pertinacious Arian Bishops. One of these complained that what he said had not been fairly taken down, and desired that "honourable men," that is, men of high position, who were within reach, should be called in as "hearers." St. Ambrose, who swayed the Synod, declared that Palladius was herein *awaiting the sentence of laymen*, whereas *Bishops ought rather to be judges of laymen*. At another western Council, held at Toledo in 400, presbyters were seated, deacons stood, and others, that is, of course, laymen, were present. The Council of the Oak, at which under the malign influence of Theophilus of Alexandria, St. Chrysostom was condemned, was an assembly of partisan Bishops, which received accusations brought by enemies of the great Bishop of Constantinople. In the course of the Pelagian controversy we find the Bishop of Jerusalem holding a Synod of the priests of his own diocese, in which, contrary to precedent, but in consideration of his position, Pelagius, who was not in Holy Orders, was permitted to *sit* while questioned as to the charges brought against him by a young presbyter from Spain. Shortly afterwards a small Synod of Bishops of Palestine was held, at which Pelagius, as Augustine represents it, obtained an acquittal on the charge of heresy by disingenuously disclaiming opinions which, in fact, he held, so that, if Pelagius was "absolved," Pelagianism was virtually "condemned." The African Councils which

treated of this question were also episcopal assemblies.

We come next to the third (Ecumenical Council, which met at Ephesus in 431, for the purpose of dealing with the Nestorian controversy. It will be remembered that Nestorianism reduced the Incarnation of the Son of God to a specially intimate alliance or association between Himself and a human individual, the Son of Mary, so that its practical result was to make two Christs instead of one. It is certain that this Council was composed of bishops only. The Imperial Commissioner disclaimed any other relation to it than that of maintaining order. He had, in fact, been expressly forbidden by the Emperor, who had summoned the Council, to take part in discussions about doctrine; his function was limited to the enforcement of regularity in the proceedings. The Archbishop of Alexandria, Cyril, presided, claiming also to hold, as we should say, a proxy for Celestine of Rome, before the arrival of Celestine's legates, which took place after the deposition of Nestorius. It ought here to be explained that a letter of Celestine's, containing the words, "Join the authority of our see to your own, act in our stead," was written to Cyril nearly a year before the Council, and while as yet there was no thought of such a Council. The commission thus given was discharged by Cyril in the latter part of the year 430, and it was not renewed, so far as we know, with a view to the Council of Ephesus. The Pope's delegates, on arriving at Ephesus, held (as usual) high language about the dignity of the see; but although the Council itself had referred to Celestine's letter to Nestorius as a ground for their sentence against Nestorius, their anathemas were uttered before that letter had been read to them; in announcing the sentence to the condemned archbishop they did not allude to Celestine; in writing to Theodosius they commended Celestine for his zeal. It may be well to add that in the list of signatures to the acts of the first session of Ephesus we find two priests signing in behalf of their invalid Bishops, one signing for his bishop under the Bishop's personal order, though present, and a deacon signing for his Bishop because, as it is curiously worded, "he was unable, or could not write." It was common enough for clerics thus to sign, simply as representing their Bishops, who for some reason were incapacitated from doing so, just as it has been common in later days for Bishops to be enthroned by proxy.

The Nestorian heresy, by re-action, pro-

duced the Eutychian. Eutyches, a devout, but ignorant and narrow-minded abbot, thought that the only way to bar out a theory which divided the Personality of the Redeemer, was to make His "oneness" depend on an absorption of His manhood into His Godhead. For this he was accused before a local Synod of Constantinople, in 448, which, after much inquiry, condemned him. The sentence was signed by thirty-two Bishops, personally or by proxy, and by a number of abbots, of whom nearly all were clerics. All these signed as abbots, but not in the form ordinarily used by Bishops signing a conciliar decree, *i.e.*, not with such words as "defining" or "judging." The Synod was, in fact, an episcopal Synod. It is so described. The abbots occupied a position lower than that of constituent members and the Imperial Commissioner afterwards disclaimed having made any pronouncement about doctrine. The controversy, as is well known, was kept up through the strong encouragement given to Eutyches by the Emperor Theodosius II., and by the Patriarch of Alexandria. The latter presided over a Council at Ephesus, infamous in Church history for its violence, and known as the "Gang of Robbers;" the Emperor, by what was thought an extraordinary favour, directing that a certain Abbot Barsumas, who was a priest, should be summoned with the Bishops to the Council. The enormities perpetrated at this assembly increased the agitation and confusion; and after the death of Theodosius the Emperor Marcian summoned the fourth General Council to meet at Chalcedon in the autumn of 451. It was a great gathering of Bishops; they alone were constituent members. The Imperial Commissioners, a number of high State functionaries, represented, as we might say, the interest of the State, and continually and seasonably interposed to secure order, but they were exterior to the Synod itself. The presiding members of the Council were the representatives of Pope Leo the Great; this fact is unquestionable, but so is the fact that the Council insisted on satisfying itself as to the orthodoxy of a Bishop whom Leo had already received into his communion—that the famous acclamation, "*Peter spoke thus by Leo*," indicated not—as on Papal principles it should have done—a dutiful acceptance of whatever the Bishop of Rome might declare *ex cathedra* upon a question of doctrine, but the conviction of the Bishops that, in his great doctrinal letter or "Tome," then read, and already signed by many Bishops in their individual capacity,

before the Council had met, Leo had been true to the teaching of St. Peter. We must also remember that the famous 28th canon of Chalcedon, about the respective positions of the Churches of Rome and Constantinople, was passed in the legates' absence after they had been invited to be present, and was adhered to, in spite of their remonstrance, and although afterwards the sanction of Leo was requested in a respectful letter from the Archbishop of Constantinople, as necessary to validate the canon, his persistent refusal did not prevent the Greek Church from acting upon it as settled Church law. As an African Church writer expresses it, "Although the apostolic see still contradicts, that which was established by the Council still remains in full force, under the patronage of the Emperor."

It may be desirable to extend our survey a little further. Toward the close of the fifth century Pope Gelasius held a Council at Rome, at which priests acted co-ordinately, or concurrently, with bishops in applauding the Pope's determination to restore to his communion a bishop who had been deposed for unfaithfulness to his trust as the Pope's legate. But what this shows is, not so much an equality of synodical right between bishops and priests, as the assertion and recognition of the supreme right of the Roman See: we must remember that the Pope was here on his own ground, and that the bishops had been accustomed to look on him as master. At Spanish Synods, in the early part of the sixth century, laymen were expressly permitted to be present, and the reason is expressly given—*That the people also might know what is to be decreed by the bishops only.* The most remarkable and instructive case is that of the Second Council of Orange, in 529; it is the last which I will bring before you. The Council is one to which Western Christendom is greatly indebted; for it drew a line between the truth which Pelagianism had assailed—the doctrine, as it is called, of Grace—and the exaggerations by which that doctrine had been compromised. It consisted of a small number of Gallic bishops, who had assembled for the dedication of a church, built by a zealous layman, himself a high civil functionary. The bishops, in their document, declare that they had discussed matters pertaining to the "rule of the Church," and had resolved to promulgate some statements of earlier writers commended to them by "the Apostolic See" on the question of grace and free will. This body of statements they call "*their definition and the definition of the Fathers.*" They then say that they had

thought fit that the lay dignitaries who had, with them, attended the recent service, should also sign what was intended to be of "healing" efficacy, not only for the clergy, but for the laity as well. Whereupon eight laymen did sign; and the remarkable point is, that they adopted the same formula used in such cases by bishops—"I sign consenting," or "I consent and sign." But this cannot imply that they were regarded as constituent members of the Synod, for that would contradict the explicit language of the document, which runs in the name of the bishops, and treats the "definition," or body of doctrinal statements as completed, as in full existence, before the laymen were invited to intimate their personal acquiescence by their signatures.

With this instance I conclude: the "Synods of the Ancient Church" may be sufficiently represented for our present purpose by those which belong to the first 530 years of the Church's life—a period which, it will be observed, extends to within seventy years of the beginning of our English Christianity.

TESTIMONY OF NAPOLEON I. WITH REGARD TO CHRIST.

BY ALEXANDER MAIR.

From *The Expositor*, London, May, 1890.

MANY of our readers have, without doubt, in the course of their reading, come across statements that professed to be the testimony of Napoleon I. with regard to Christ. They may have met with those statements sometimes in the form of a mere sentence, sometimes as an extract of less or greater length, and sometimes in the form of a separate tract. But if their experience has been the same as ours, they must often have asked, but asked in vain, What is the authority on which such statements rest? For whatever their form, we have all but invariably found them given without any exact and explicit reference to the original authority, a defect which to many minds must deprive them of most of their weight.

We recently had occasion to look somewhat carefully into the question of the genuineness of this alleged testimony, and after a little trouble succeeded in getting pretty well to the root of the matter, and reaching such ground as the case seems to admit of. We venture to think that it may be interesting to not a few of our readers to learn the result of our investigation; and accordingly we proceed to lay before them, first of all a

statement which a tolerable itself.

The careful Dr. S. Church on the tells u bot's Confid Napo

"with source could defin name be,† source fact, of it fers t of M serts, Fren doub He l sever them they mon ques clos

Dr. in w Reli as g Tra that ably We plan I sou Dr. ing boo lyin the Ch cue No Br

Dr. in w Reli as g Tra that ably We plan I sou Dr. ing boo lyin the Ch cue No Br

Dr. in w Reli as g Tra that ably We plan I sou Dr. ing boo lyin the Ch cue No Br

Dr. in w Reli as g Tra that ably We plan I sou Dr. ing boo lyin the Ch cue No Br

Dr. in w Reli as g Tra that ably We plan I sou Dr. ing boo lyin the Ch cue No Br

statement with regard to the authority on which the alleged testimony rests, and then a tolerably full translation of the testimony itself.

The reader may find the narrative of a careful investigation of the question by Dr. Schaff, of New York, the well-known Church historian, in his interesting volume on the *Person of Christ*.^{*} Dr. Schaff there tells us that he found the testimony in Abbot's *Life of Napoleon*, and also in Abbot's *Confidential Correspondence of the Emperor Napoleon with the Empress Josephine*, "without however being traced to a reliable source." He made what investigation he could in America, but without any more definite result than the discovery of the name of the book which he suspected might be,† and which actually is, the original source, although he failed to ascertain the fact, through not being able to find a copy of it in the libraries of New York. He refers to a printed letter of Professor de Felice of Montauban, in which the professor "asserts, that the testimony as published in the French tract [referred to below] is undoubtedly genuine, but gives no proofs." He latterly entered into correspondence with several gentlemen in France, and amongst them Pastor Bersier, who however, while they affirmed the genuineness of the testimony, were unable to trace it up to the unquestionably original authority. At the close of the narrative of his investigation, Dr. Schaff prints the testimony in the form in which it is given in tract No. 200 of the Religious Tract Society of Paris, and then as given in tract No. 477 of the American Tract Society. He adds, "It will be seen that the French and English differ considerably, but they breathe the same spirit." We shall immediately see the complete explanation.

In endeavouring to hunt up the original source we fared no better in Edinburgh than Dr. Schaff did in New York. But in trying Paris we met with more success. The book which is the original source is now lying before us, and in its latest edition bears the title, *Sentiment de Napoléon I^{er} sur le Christianisme, d'après des témoignages recueillis par feu le chevalier de Beauterne*.‡ Nouvelle édition. Par M. Bouniol (Paris: Bray, 1868). It is from the fifth chapter

^{*} Pp. 219-250.

† In the first edition (1890), he says the testimony is "probably derived" from the book referred to; and in the second edition he says, "It seems to have been published first in 1842 and 1843 in periodicals and tracts, and also in the [said] book" (p. 224 in both editions).

‡ Beauterne was an ardent Roman Catholic and a great admirer of Napoleon. He was the author of two other works; *Mort de l'Enfant Impie*, and *L'Enfance de Napoléon*.

of this work, according to the numbering in this edition, that all the different forms of the testimony have been originally derived. The exact title of the third edition of Beauterne's book (1843) was, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme: conversations religieuses recueillies à Sainte-Hélène par M. le général comte de Montholon*; from which it appears that the earlier editions actually bore on the title-page the name of Montholon as the authority for the conversations therein reported. The new edition now before us professes to have been in some respects abridged and in others enlarged by Bouniol, its late editor; but its fifth chapter seems to have undergone no change, except it may be the omission of sentences or portions here and there. Further, we may add that this same chapter, which is indeed the kernel of the book, was also reproduced in pamphlet form with the title, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur la Divinité de Jésus-Christ: pensées recueillies à Sainte-Hélène par M. le comte de Montholon, et publiées par M. le chevalier de Beauterne* (2^e édition, 1841, Debécourt).^{*} Unfortunately however we have not been able to find copies either of this pamphlet or of the third edition referred to above.

Our next object must be to consider whether we can make good the authenticity of the alleged testimony; and here we must first let Beauterne speak for himself. He says:

"Of the sources from which I have drawn, the first line is formed by the Emperor's companions in exile [in St. Helena]. But the person to whom my most respectful thanks are due is Count Montholon. I might almost say that the entire collection is much more his work than mine. The literary form is mine. But I affirm, and I repeat it, that the thoughts, the arguments, are the spirit, the language, the work of Napoleon himself."[†]

Again he says:

"The style and even entire phrases belong to the Emperor, sometimes literally, as for example that sentence which stands at the head of his conversation concerning Jesus Christ: 'I know men, and I tell you that Jesus is not a man.'"[‡]

And once more he says:

"I repeat then that my documents are authentic, having emanated from living and contemporary personages, who have given them to me as the authors or the witnesses of the facts which I recount. All my book is true with regard to principal and essence."[§]

In so far as chapter v. is concerned, the portion with which we have immediately to do, the capital authority is General Montholon.

^{*} In Lorenz's *Catalogue général de la Librairie française* this brochure is actually entered under the name of Montholon, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme*, pp. 14, 15.

[†] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[§] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

lon. Accordingly we naturally ask, What is the value of Montholon's authority? There can be no doubt that it is of the highest order. He had the best possible opportunity for being able to report the Emperor's conversations and sayings. He was his close and faithful companion during all the time of his exile in St. Helena, and in his will the Emperor appointed him one of his executors, leaving him a bequest of 2,000,000 francs, "as a proof of my satisfaction and the filial care which he bestowed on me for six years."* M. Marchand, the chief *valet de chambre* of the Emperor in his banishment, wrote to Beauterne: "No one can contradict anything that has been communicated to you by Count Montholon, for he enjoyed the most intimate confidence of the Emperor, and was therefore in a better position than any one else to be acquainted with everything that took place at Longwood" (Napoleon's home on St. Helena).†

We can now take a decided step forward, and one which is of the utmost importance. After Beauterne had published the first edition of his work, he sent an early copy of it to Montholon, who was at that time a political prisoner in the State prison of Ham. Along with that copy he wrote to him as follows: "I hope that the religious views of the Emperor, collected from your lips, and which I have already read to you in part, I believe, will please you still more in the citadel of Ham than in your apartment in the Luxembourg." To that letter Count Montholon replied on May 30th, 1841: "I have read with a lively interest your work, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme*, and I do not think it is possible to express better the religious beliefs of the Emperor."‡ It should also be remembered that Montholon survived until 1853, so that before his death Beauterne's book and extracts from it must have been circulating in France for years with his knowledge, and even with his consent; for, as we have seen, the earlier editions bore his name upon the title-page. Dr. Schaff says that "General Bertrand [to whom the utterances are alleged to have been at least partly addressed] and General Montholon would be the proper vouchers, since they heard and must have repeated the utterances at St. Helena."§ We have thus succeeded in getting this condition so far fulfilled, by tracing up the report of the conversation or conversations to

Montholon, and in having his authentication of that report.

But now we have to consider whether General Bertrand has anything to say in regard to the matter. He has, and apparently in direct contradiction to the above. When he was in St. Helena with the Emperor, he wrote out to his dictation the memorials of the campaigns in Egypt and Syria. These memorials the general had prepared for publication, but he died on January 31st, 1844, before his purpose had been carried out. The work however was published by his sons in 1847, with a long preface from the hand of Bertrand himself, in which he touches on a variety of matters in a somewhat fragmentary way. In this preface he refers to Beauterne's work under its original title, *Conversations religieuses de Napoléon*, and speaks of it with bitterness as a "libel," because of statements which it makes offensive to himself and his wife. He then goes on to say: "In that book one has dared to present to the public, as collected in St. Helena, two pretended conversations between the Emperor and his grand-marshal [Bertrand], the one on the divinity of Jesus Christ, consisting of little less than fifty pages, the other on the existence of God. These two conversations, inclosed in inverted commas, are a pure invention; they do not contain a single word of truth, nor ONE." Again he says, "Neither in France, nor in the army, nor in the Island of Elba, nor in St. Helena, have I heard Napoleon discussing the existence of God or the divinity of Jesus Christ."† This is very explicit, and is emphatic even to capitals.

What then are we to make of this apparent contradiction? On the one hand, we have the strong and repeated asseverations of Beauterne already given. We have the facts that the contents of the book were read over to Montholon, at least in part, before it was printed, and that an early copy of the printed work was sent to him and read by him with lively interest. Above all, we have Montholon's attestation of the contents of the book, and very specially of chapter v., as the best possible expression of

* *Conversations religieuses de Napoléon*, récit authentique de sa mort chrétienne, avec des documents inédits de la plus haute importance, où il révèle lui-même sa pensée intime sur le christianisme, 1840.

† *Guerre d'Orient: Campagnes d'Égypte et de Syrie*, vol. 1, pp. 1, li. (Paris, 1847). The French is: "Dans cet écrit on a osé présenter au public, comme recueillies à Sainte-Hélène, deux prétendues conversations entre l'Empereur et son grand-marshal, l'une sur la divinité de Jésus-Christ, et n'ayant guère moins de cinquante pages, l'autre sur l'existence de Dieu. Ces deux conversations guillemetées sont une pure invention; elles ne renferment pas un seul mot de vrai, UN SEUL. . . . Ni en France, ni à l'armée, ni à l'île d'Elbe, ni à Sainte-Hélène, je n'ai entendu Napoléon discuter sur l'existence de Dieu, ou sur la divinité de Jésus-Christ."

* *Sentiment de Napoléon*, p. 16.

† *Ibid.*, p. 16.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 156 f. Cf. also p. viii. The French is, "J'ai lu avec un vif intérêt votre ouvrage, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme*; et je ne pense pas qu'il soit possible de mieux exprimer les croyances religieuses de l'Empereur."

§ *Person of Christ*, p. 223.

the Emperor's religious views. No doubt it must be confessed that the form of this attestation is somewhat general; he does not say in so many words that the conversations are correctly reported; nevertheless, in view very particularly of the strong and repeated protestations and asseverations contained in the book, it practically amounts to this. Furthermore we find Montholon speaking of Beauterne as a "conscientious author," and on one occasion writing to him to "correct certain mistakes to which his standing as a conscientious author might give weight,"* so that we may with all the greater confidence accept the material which the general not only allows to pass current for years with his name attached, but which he explicitly endorses. We even find Montholon in another letter confidently referring Beauterne to Bertrand himself as certain to substantiate his report of the Emperor's "religious conversations."† On the other hand, Bertrand's statement is not less, is even more emphatic. It is indeed a flat contradiction. How then is the difficulty to be explained?

If we are to have regard solely to the opinion of the English chroniclers of Napoleon's exile in St. Helena, we should place but little reliance on the veracity of either Montholon or Bertrand, when the supposed glory of the Emperor is concerned. O'Meara speaks of Montholon as one, who, "were he not a poltroon and a liar, would be a most excellent man, and who, but for these two little defects, is a perfect gentleman."‡ Forsyth denies "Bertrand's claim to be regarded as a person of veracity," and declares that he "never failed to bear false witness against Sir Hudson Lowe [the governor of St. Helena], whenever he thought the interests of Napoleon required it."§ Of course French writers give the two generals a character directly the opposite; but perhaps it is of more consequence for us to remember that both of them were the close and highly esteemed companions of the Emperor, who was a thoroughly good judge of men, and was not in the least likely to select as his friends men who were mere fools, poltroons, and liars. Moreover both Montholon and Bertrand, especially the former, have left behind them memorials of the Emperor's life, by which their general veracity may be tested; and from these it appears that, while they show the usual bias of men en-

thralled by a more powerful personality, there is no sufficient reason for doubting the genuineness of their evidence in reference to such a matter as that before us. Accordingly we regard it as utterly incredible that Montholon should have fabricated, or sanctioned the fabrication of, such a tissue of lies and forgeries, and not only permitted them to be published with his name attached, while his brother general was still living, but even appealed to him for confirmation. On the other hand, we hold it equally incredible that the strong, categorical denial of Bertrand is merely a bit of deliberate hard lying, though it may militate somewhat against its force that it should have been withheld during his life, and only published by his sons three years after his death.

We suggest the following as an explanation of the difficulty. Montholon had apartments and lived in the same house with the Emperor all the time of his exile; Bertrand always lived with his family in a separate house, and for some time at the distance of a mile and a half. Montholon not only lived under the same roof with the Emperor, but in constant and close companionship, dining with him every day. There was thus the most natural and ample opportunity for Montholon having numerous conversations on Christianity with Napoleon in the absence of Bertrand. Our solution therefore is, that two or three of the pregnant sentences at the beginning and the close of Beauterne's report may have been incidentally addressed to Bertrand, and the fact forgotten by him, or they may have been related by Montholon through mistake of memory as having been addressed to Bertrand; but that in either case the body of the chapter consists of fragmentary reports of different conversations of the Emperor which took place casually with Montholon or in his hearing, and were worked up and expanded by Beauterne. This view of the chapter is strongly confirmed by the title which it bore when published in the separate pamphlet form referred to above, in which it is described as *Thoughts Collected at St. Helena by Count Montholon*. Moreover this solution, as we shall presently see, is supported by internal evidence, and is in full accordance with the view of the chapter which we had adopted before we were aware of Bertrand's explicit denial. Indeed, Bertrand's volumes prove quite conclusively that, so far as Napoleon's religious views are concerned, he might very well have uttered all that is to be found in Beauterne's chapter, while at the same time he informs

* *Sentiment de Napoléon*, Letter, pp. 148 f.

† *Ibid.*, p. 40.

‡ Forsyth's *History of the Captivity of Napoleon at St. Helena*, letter quoted vol. I., p. 186.

§ *History of the Captivity of Napoleon at St. Helena*, vol. III., pp. 203 f.

us that the Emperor frequently spoke "more like a philosopher than a general." *

We do not mean to enter at any length into the internal criticism of the special chapter of Beauterne's book now before us, but a few sentences on the subject are necessary. The French editor of our copy says in a foot-note: "Napoleon never uttered at one breath this magnificent apology. The author must have collected and joined together here what was said in different conversations."† This is almost certainly correct; and we infer it, not merely from the length of the chapter, but from the fact that we find reduplications in it, which suggest that it consists of reports of different conversations on the same or a cognate subject. Furthermore, the want of a clear, straight line running through it, the obvious roughness of the joinings here and there, and the distinct feeling of fragmentariness occasionally produced in the mind of the reader point to the same conclusion. In any case we cannot accept such a lengthened report taken down after the lapse of years as at all *verbatim*, notwithstanding Beauterne's assertion that the companions of the Emperor faithfully preserved the memory of his conversations "with that scrupulousness and respect which everything inspires that proceeds from a great man." But while there can be no reasonable doubt that the declaration of Bertrand greatly detracts from the weight of the evidence in favour of the genuineness, nevertheless, in view of all the circumstances of the case, we think we may still accept the report as a fairly correct, if somewhat worked up and expanded, reproduction of the substance, with many of the expressions and even occasional brief sentences, of casual conversations of the Emperor. Indeed, the expressions at times authenticate themselves by their characteristic nerve and point, for, as Beauterne remarks, "one cannot counterfeits genius."

The general conclusion to which our investigation has conducted us is supported, so far as we have seen, by the consensus of competent men who have expressed an opinion on the matter. Auguste Nicolas, in a work of decided importance in its day, entitled, *Études philosophiques sur le Christianisme*, quotes a large portion of Beauterne's fifth chapter *verbatim*. He then adds in a foot-note: "This judgment of Napoleon with regard to Jesus Christ was published in a book written in 1841, after

communication received from General Montholon. Quoted repeatedly and in circumstances of responsibility, that judgment passes as historical. Besides, its value does not consist merely in its authenticity, but consists especially in the force of truth which distinguishes it, and the touch of originality of which it bears the stamp. And that again contributes to the support of its authenticity; *one sees there the claw of the lion.*" * Lacordaire, who, like Nicolas, was a contemporary and likely to have been well acquainted with the facts, also quotes from the conversations, and evidently accepts them as unquestionably authentic.† Professor de Felice, of Montauban, another contemporary and thoroughly competent authority, as we have already seen, regards the conversations as undoubtedly genuine.‡ The late Pastor Bersier held the same view: "I believe in the perfect authenticity [of the reported conversations]. No one, especially at that time, could have invented them;" and then he finishes with almost the same expression as Nicolas, "There is the claw of the lion there."§ The author of the article on Napoleon in the *Nouvelle Biographie générale*, after some hesitation, decides in favour of inserting Beauterne's book among the genuine, and not among the apocryphal, Napoleonic literature. The conversations are also accepted as genuine by Luthardt in his *Grundwahrheiten des Christenthums*,|| and among English authors by Canon Liddon in his *Divinity of our Lord*,¶ and Cardinal Newman in his *Grammar of Assent*.** Dr. Schaff also, at the close of his careful investigation, arrives at the same general conclusion: "The conversations are authentic in substance; because they have the egotistic manner of Napoleon, and are marked by that massive grandeur and granite-like simplicity of thought and style which characterize the best of his utterances." ††

The original source of Napoleon's testimony in regard to Christ is thus to be found in the fifth chapter of the edition of Beau-

* Vol. iv., pp. 89 f., 9th edition (Paris, 1855).

† *Conferences on Jesus Christ*, pp. 36 ff. (London, 1870).

‡ Schaff, *Person of Christ*, p. 284 f.

§ *Ibid.*, letter to Dr. Schaff, p. 284 (1880).

¶ Pp. 234, 293, fourth edition.

‡ Pp. 150 f., eleventh edition.

** Pp. 480 ff., eighth edition. Cf. also Geikie, *Life of Christ*, chap. i.; Farrar, *Witness of History to Christ*, p. 81; and Naville, *The Christ*, p. 174 (Edinburgh, 1880).

†† *Person of Christ*, p. 225. The same series of extracts as in Schaff's English tract is given as genuine in a little volume entitled *The Table Talk and Opinions of Napoleon*, pp. 112-122 (London: Sampson Low, Son & Marston, 1868); cf. also a brief series of extracts in O'Meara's *Napoleon at St. Helena*, vol. ii., pp. 353 ff. (1868). In none of all the above is Beauterne's book given as the original source, although it is mentioned by Liddon; and, singularly enough, not one of the French authors mentions Bertrand's contradiction. Liddon, however, does so in a note on p. 151.

* Cf. *Campagnes d'Égypte et de Syrie*, vol. i., pp. xvi., liv., and very specially a long passage on the Christian religion, vol. i., pp. 206 ff.

† *Sensiment de Napoléon*, p. 87.

terne's book now before us. When we turn to it we see the difficulty at once cleared up which presented itself to Dr. Schaff; namely, the difference between the French and English tracts as printed by him. Beaunterne's fifth chapter is a somewhat long one, extending over thirty-three pages,* and both tracts, being much smaller than the original, consist only of selections therefrom. The selections of which the French tract is composed are naturally to a considerable extent different from those of which the English one is composed. But the French tract is made up of passages taken *verbatim* from the chapter in question. It is indeed sentence for sentence, and word for word, the same as the extracts we find in the work of Nicolas referred to above. The English tract again, as given by Dr. Schaff, is a somewhat larger collection of extracts than the French one; but in going over it carefully we find that every sentence, with the exception of an unimportant one of five lines, which comes in quite abruptly, has its corresponding sentence in the original of Beaunterne. It has also a brief introduction to make the tract more intelligible, which is not to be found in our fifth chapter, and which may possibly be derived from the reproduction of this chapter separately published in the form already referred to.

We now proceed to give a translation of the portions of this chapter which especially bear upon the Person of Christ. Of course our selection differs somewhat from both the French and the English tracts reprinted by Dr. Schaff, but the explanation will now be plain; and we need scarcely add that every sentence has its corresponding sentence in the original.

"One evening at St. Helena the conversation was animated. The subject treated of was an exalted one; it was the divinity of Jesus Christ. Napoleon defended the truth of this doctrine with the arguments and eloquence of a man of genius, with something also of the native faith of the Corsican and the Italian. To the objections of one of the interlocutors, who seemed to see in the Saviour but a sage, an illustrious philosopher, a great man, the Emperor replied:—

"I know men, and I tell you that Jesus Christ is not a man.

"Superficial minds may see some resemblance between Christ and the founders of empires, the conquerors, and the gods of other religions. That resemblance does not exist. Any one who has a

true knowledge of things and experience of men will cut short the question as I do. Which of us contemplating in the spirit of criticism the different religions of the nations cannot look their authors in the face and say, "No; you are neither gods nor the agents of the Deity. You have no mission from heaven; you are rather the missionaries of lies. Assuredly you have been kneaded out of the same clay as other mortals!"

"I see in Lycurgus, Numa, Confucius, and Mahomet merely legislators; but nothing which reveals the Deity. On the contrary, I see numerous relations between them and myself. I make out resemblances, weaknesses, and common errors which assimilate them to myself and humanity. Their faculties are those which I possess. But it is different with Christ. Everything about Him astonishes me; His spirit surprises me, and His will confounds me. Between Him and anything of this world there is no possible term of comparison. He is really a Being apart. His ideas and His emotions, the truth which He announces, His method of producing conviction, can be explained neither by the organization of man nor by the nature of things.

"His birth and the history of His life, the profoundness of His teaching—which truly reaches the very summit of the difficulties, and which is their most admirable solution,—His gospel, the uniqueness of this mysterious Being, His appearance, His empire, His march across ages and kingdoms, all is to me a marvel, a mystery unfathomable: a mystery which I cannot deny, and yet which I am just as unable to explain. Here I see nothing of man. The nearer I approach Him and the more closely I examine Him, the more everything seems above me; everything continues great with a greatness that crushes me.

"His religion is a secret belonging to Himself alone, and proceeds from an intelligence which assuredly is not the intelligence of man. There is in Him a profound originality which creates a series of sayings and maxims hitherto unknown. Jesus borrows nothing from any of the sciences. You find in Himself alone the ideal or example of His life. He is not a philosopher; for He proceeds by the method of miracles, and from the beginning His disciples are His worshippers. He persuades them by an appeal to their moral sense, rather than by the ostentatious display of method and logic. His business is with the soul; He occupies Himself with it, and to it He addresses His gospel. The soul alone satisfies Him as He satisfies the soul. Until the time of His coming the soul was nothing; matter and force were the masters of the world. At His voice everything falls into order. Science and philosophy are henceforth but secondary matters; the soul has regained its sovereignty. All scholastic scaffolding collapses in ruin before that single word, FAITH. What a Master! what a word that must be which effects such a revolution!

"Christ expects everything from His death. Is that the invention of a man? On the contrary, it is a strange course of procedure, a superhuman confidence, an inexplicable reality. In every other existence than that of Christ, what imperfections, what changes! Where is the character which does not bend aside when overthrown by obstacles? Who is the individual that is not moulded by event and place, that does not yield to the influence of the age, that has not compounded with its manners and its passions? I defy you to cite any existence, other than that of Christ, exempt from the least vacillation, free from all such blemishes and changes. From the first day to the last He is the

* Pp. 85-118.

+ There is a long report of a similar conversation given by Las Cases, *Journal of the Private Life and Conversations of the Emperor Napoleon at St. Helena*, vol. II., Part Fourth, pp. 129 ff. It begins thus: "In the evening, after dinner, the conversation turned upon religion. The Emperor dwelt on the subject at length. After having spoken for some time with warmth and animation he said, 'Everything proclaims the existence of God: that cannot be questioned.'" (Cf. also *Campagnes d'Égypte et de Syrie*, vol. I., chap. v.).

same, always the same, majestic and simple, infinitely severe and infinitely gentle. In the intercourse of a public life He never gives a handle to the smallest criticism; His conduct so prudent compels admiration by its mixture of force and gentleness. Whether He speaks or acts, Jesus is luminous, unchangeable, unmoved by passion. The sublime, some one says, is a mark of the Deity; what name shall we give to Him who unites in Himself all the features of the sublime?

"Christ proves that He is the Son of the Eternal by His contempt of time; all His doctrines mean one and the same thing, Eternity. How the horizon of His empire extends, and prolongs itself into infinitude! Christ reigns beyond life and beyond death. The past and the future are alike to Him: the kingdom of the truth has, and in effect can have, no other limit than the false. Jesus has taken possession of the human race; He has made of it a single nationality, the nationality of upright men, whom He calls to a perfect life.

"Christ commands us with authority to believe Him, without giving any other reason than that tremendous word, *I am God*. He declares it. What a chasm He scoops out by that declaration between Himself and all the fabricators of religions! What audacity, what sacrilege, what blasphemy, if it is not true! There is no middle position; either Christ is an impostor or He is God. But the divinity of Christ once admitted, the system of Christian doctrine presents itself with the precision and clearness of algebra. We must admire in it the connectedness and unity of a science. The existence of Christ from beginning to end is a tissue entirely mysterious, I admit; but that mystery meets difficulties which are in all existences. Reject it, the world is an enigma; accept it, and we have an admirable solution of the history of man.

"Christ never varies, never hesitates in His teaching; and His smallest affirmations are marked with the seal of a simplicity and a depth which captivate the ignorant and the educated alike. Nowhere else do you find that series of beautiful ideas, of beautiful moral maxims, which defile before us like the battalions of the celestial host, and which produce in our mind the same feeling as we experience in contemplating the infinite expanse of the heavens in a clear summer night, resplendent with all the brilliancy of the stars.

"Christ speaks, and henceforth generations belong to Him by bonds more close, more intimate than those of blood, by a union more sacred, more imperious than any other union beside. He kindles the flame of a love which kills out the love of self, and prevails over every other love. Without contradiction, the greatest miracle of Christ is the reign of love. All who believe sincerely in Him feel this love, wonderful, supernatural, supreme. It is a phenomenon inexplicable, impossible to reason and the power of man; a sacred fire given to the earth by this new Prometheus, of which time, the great destroyer, can neither exhaust the force nor terminate the duration. This is what I wonder at most of all, for I often think about it; and it is that which absolutely proves to me the divinity of Christ."

"Here the voice of the Emperor assumed a peculiar accent of ironical melancholy and of profound sadness: 'Yes, our existence has shone with all the splendour of the crown and sovereignty; and yours, Monthonon, Bertrand, reflected that splendour, as the dome of the Invalides, gilded by us, reflects the rays of the sun. But reverses have come, the gold is effaced little by little. The rain of misfortunes and outrages with which we are deluged

every day carries away the last particles. We are only lead, gentlemen, and soon we shall be but dust. Such is the destiny of great men; such is the near destiny of the great Napoleon.

"What an abyss between my profound misery and the eternal reign of Christ, proclaimed, worshipped, beloved, adored, living throughout the whole universe! Is that to die? Is it not rather to live? Behold the death of Christ, and behold that of God!"

"The Emperor was silent; and as General Bertrand equally kept silence, the Emperor resumed, 'If you do not understand that Jesus Christ is God, ah well! then I did wrong in making you a general!'"

THAT DELFTSHAVEN MONUMENT.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, May 8, 1890.

It is of the essence of history to be exact. Monumental history comes under special bonds to accuracy, that it may not reproduce what Pope stigmatized:

How London's column pointing at the skies,
Like a tall bully lifts its head, and lies.

It was bad enough for the hero of Pinaro to weep over the tombs of somebody else's ancestors, who had been made his by purchase of the graveyard; it would be worse to mislead posterity into moistening with commemorative tears a spot of virgin soil where nobody at all has been interred, or solicits remembrance.

Our attention has been attracted to a circular issued under the auspices of the Congregational Club of this city, the object of which is by a "national" and "catholic," in distinction from a "local" and "sectarian," movement, to form a "National Association" to raise a sum of money to secure the erection "at Delftshaven" in Holland of "some durable token," which shall commemorate "the hospitality of the free Republic of Holland so generously bestowed upon the Pilgrims," who "sailed from Delftshaven on a voyage which was completed at Plymouth Rock."

Two or three suggestions in the interest of the real facts seem to be in order in connection with this appeal.

It would appear that the "voyage which was completed at Plymouth Rock" really began at Leyden, and not at Delfshaven. Certainly four distinct debarkations took place. Our fathers went in *trekschuits* (draw-boats) from Leyden fourteen or fifteen miles through canal and river to Delfshaven; there they went on board the *Speedwell* and in her to England; there they went on board the *Mayflower* and in her to Cape Cod Harbor, and the Cowyard in Plymouth Bay; there they went on board the

shallop for the last mile and a half to Plymouth Rock, where the voyage ended. There is no obvious reason why the first of these well-marked stages should be ignored.

Moreover, to do this seems specially ill judged, when the effect of it must be to take away the emphasis of commemoration from the place of their residence for more than eleven years, where it especially belongs, unwarrantably to bestow it upon a hamlet where they tarried but for a night; from the town toward which, notwithstanding all they had suffered there, in departing they looked back with moistened eyes as to "a goodly & pleasant citie," and where many of them were leaving all that they loved best to a few scattering houses lining a long and narrow quay, which there is no evidence that any one of them had ever seen before; whose little population looked on them with a vacant wonder which indeed deepened into something of sympathetic interest as the noise of "sighs and sobbs and praises did sound amongst them," and some of whom, it was said, remembered the unusual scene for a considerable period, but whose sole personal relation to it was like that of the wharf loungers who idly watch the departure of the steamers from the Cunard moorings at East Boston, as compared with that of those who go on board to sail, or to bid departing friends good-by. We have not forgotten that thirty years ago the estimable M. Cohen Stuart, then minister of the gospel at Utrecht, undertook to make it out that the parting meeting of Robinson with his flock took place in the little Reformed church which still stands upon the other side of the dock from the spot where the *Speedwell* lay, and that, on the strength of his pleasing romance, a stone on which it was thought possible that the good man's foot might have rested as he spake, was brought over to be builded as a memorial into a Chicago meeting-house. Nor have we forgotten how subsequent exhaustive research upon the ground has shown that not one jot or tittle, either of proof or probability, stands behind that fiction to give it even semblance of foundation upon fact.

Again, in no proper present sense of the term was Holland, at the date referred to, a "free Republic." The Union of Utrecht, in 1579, did not intend a republic, nor, indeed, an independent commonwealth of any kind. On the other hand, it acknowledged and indorsed obedience to the Spanish king. So neither did the Declaration of Independence of 1581, although deposing Philip, proclaim a new government. It did not

contemplate a democracy, nor even an aristocracy. The Dutch preferred the rule of a king, only they could not any longer endure the outrageous misrule of the king they had. They tried long, in vain, to persuade Elizabeth of England to be their queen. The best epithet which Mr. Motley could find with which, in 1617, to characterize the Dutch Government then actual was "a provincial and meagre federalism." He said the Netherlands were "a confederacy, not a nation," and their "general government was but a committee."

Still further, proof is wholly wanting that, such as it was, the existing government of Holland ever took any action in reference to our fathers, or officially—or even otherwise—knew of their presence in the land.

And with regard to the action in their case of the municipal authorities of Leyden, it would be unduly straining language for a purpose to try to make it out as being "hospitality so generously bestowed." Precisely what took place was this: Robinson and his company asked permission to live in Leyden and work at their trades "without being a burden in the least to any one," and the burgomasters replied that they refused no honest persons liberty to come there to live, "provided such persons behave themselves, and submit to the laws and ordinances." This was straightforward and honorable on both sides, but will hardly bear exaltation as a shining illustration of lavish hospitality.

And, finally, if the general question be raised whether our Pilgrim Fathers did not receive in Holland a "hospitality generously bestowed"—if not technically from the government, then practically from the people—the sober answer must be made that no trace of such treatment appears. An ounce of matter-of-fact record at the time is worth a ton of the rhetoric of to-day. There are but two witnesses whose contemporaneous testimony survives, but both are competent, and both agree. Governor Winslow (*Hypocrisy Unmasked*, etc., 88) incidentally names, as among chief causes of their desire to come to America:

Considering amongst many other inconveniences, how hard the Country was where we lived, how many spent their estate in it, and were forced to return for England, etc.

And Governor Bradford, much more elaborately (*Hist. Plym. Plant.*, 13, 22, etc.), says:

Though they saw faire & beautifull cities, flowing with abundance of all sorts of wealth & riches, yet it was not longe before they saw the grimme & grisly face of povertie coming upon them like an

armed man, with whom they must buke & encounter, and from whom they could not flye. . . .

They saw & found by experience the hardnes of ye place & cuntry to be such, as few in comparison would come to them, and fewer that would bide it out, and continew with them. For many yt came to them, and many more yt desired to be with them, could not endure yt great labor and hard fare, with other inconveniences which they underwent & were contented with . . . for many though they desired to injoye ye ordinances of God in their puritie, and ye libertie of the gospell with them, yet, alas, they admitted of bondage, with danger of conscience, rather then to indure these hardships; yea, some preferred & chose ye prisons in England, rather than this libertie in Holland, with these afflictions. . . .

Old age began to steale on many of them (and their great & continuall labours, with other crosses and sorrows, hastened it before ye time) so as it was not only probably thought, but apparently seen, that within a few years more they would be in danger to scatter, by necessities pressing them, or sinke under their burdens, or both. . . .

Many of their children, that were of best dispositions and gracious inclinations, having lernde to bear ye yooke in their youth, and willing to bear parte of their parents burden, were, often times, so oppressed with their hevie labours, that though their minds were free and willing, yet their bodies bowed under ye weight of ye same, and became decreped in their early youth; the vigor of nature being consumed in ye very budd as it were.

So that, while thankful to be permitted to be outside, rather than inside, of a jail; thankful for some occasional friendly appreciation of the honesty of their lives, and the good quality of their work done; thankful for permission to worship God according to their conscience so long as they did it in a private house, and made no public fuss about it; thankful for permission to earn their daily bread by the dripping sweat of their brows; and, in general, to enjoy the common privileges of common life, except so far as occasional abridgment was demanded by the English Government, and submitted to by the Leyden authorities; the sober truth is that our fathers had a very hard time in Holland. They had heard that the American savages were in the habit of

flaying men alive with ye shells of fishes, cutting of ye members & joynts of others by peesmeale, and broiling on ye coles, eate ye collops of their flesh in their sight whilst they live; with other cruelties horrible to be related;

yet, on the whole, they thought it wiser to risk all such wild Western "hospitalities," in exchange for those under which they groaned being burdened where they were; reversing Hamlet's philosophy, and flying to others that they knew not of, rather than longer to bear those ills they had.

The sons of the Pilgrims have great reason to be thankful to God that, in His all-

wise providence, He put their fathers to school in Holland on their way from Scrooby hither. Yet they have no special call to erect anywhere in that country—least of all in Delfshaven—any monument to commemorate a Dutch "hospitality" to the Plymouth men, unsuspected at the time, which it has taken near two centuries and three-quarters to discover. More than forty years ago the accurate George Sumner summed up his extended studies on the ground into this conclusion (*3 Mass. Hist. Coll.* 9 : 43) :

Although they [the Pilgrims] were far from exciting, on the part of the Dutch people and magistrates, those feelings of contempt and ill-will toward themselves, the existence of which has been so often charged by their enemies, yet they were equally far from experiencing any excess of kind attention and magisterial favor. . . . The condition of the Pilgrims while in Holland was one of poverty and obscurity.

The movement of the National Council to affix a suitably inscribed bronze tablet to the wall of St. Peter's in Leyden, in memory of the interment thereunder of John Robinson, and in recognition of his relation to the Christian settlement of New England, is open to none of these objections, and appeals tenderly to the religious and patriotic sympathies of the descendants of the old colonists all over the land.

THE CREATION STORY.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, April 26, 1890.

IN recent controversies on the trustworthiness of the Scripture record, much has been thought to turn on the Creation Story; and the special and separate importance thus attached to it has given it a separate and prominent position in the public view. This constitutes in itself a reason for addressing ourselves at once to the consideration of it, apart from any more general investigation touching either the older Scriptures at large, or any of the books which collectively compose them.

But there are broader and deeper reasons for this separate consideration. It is suggested by the form which has been given to the relation itself. The narrative given with wonderful succinctness in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis, and in the first three verses of the second chapter, stands distinct in essential points from all that follows. It is a solitary and striking example of the detailed exposition of physi-

cal facts. For such an example we must suppose a purpose, and we have to inquire what that purpose was. Next, it seems, as it were, to trespass on the ground of science, and to assert a rival authority. And further, forming no part, unless toward its close, of the history of man, and nowhere touching on human action, it severs itself from the rest of the Sacred Volume, and appears more as a preface to the history than as a part of it.

And yet there are signs in subsequent portions of the volume that this tale of the Creation was regarded by the Hebrews as both authoritative and important; for it gave form and shape to portions of their literature in the central department of its devotions. Nay, traces of it may, perhaps, be found in the Book of Job (Job xxxviii.), where the Almighty challenges the patriarch on the primordial works of creation. More clearly in Psalm civ., where we have light, the firmament, the waters and their severance and confinement within bounds,—a succession the same as in Genesis. Then follow mixedly the animal and vegetable creations, and man as the climax crowns the series in verse 23. So in Psalm cxlviii. we have, first (vs. 1-6), the heavens, the heavenly bodies, and the atmosphere; then, again mixedly, the earth and the agents affecting it, with the animate population (vs. 7-10), and lastly man. There is some variation in the order of the details, but the idea of consecutive development, or evolution, is clearly impressed upon the whole. At a later date, and only known in the Greek tongue, we find a more nearly exact resemblance in the Song of the Three Children. The heavenly bodies and phenomena occupy the first division of the Song; then the earth is invoked to bless the Lord, with its mountains, vegetation, and waters; then the animate population of water, air, and land, in the order pursued in the first chapter of Genesis, with the same remarkable omission of the great kingdom of the Reptiles at their proper place. Then follow the children of men, and these fill the closing portion of the Song. The most noteworthy differences seem to be that there is no mention of the first beginnings of vegetation, and no supplemental notice, as in Genesis i. 24-30, of the reptiles.

But also the sun, moon, and stars, which are categorically placed later in Genesis than vegetation, precede in the Song any notice of the earth. Let not this difference be hastily called a discrepancy. Each mode is to be explained by considering the character and purpose of the composition. In Gen-

esis, it is a narrative; in the Song, it is a panorama. Genesis, as a rule, refers each of the great factors of the visible world to its due order of origin in time; the Song enumerates the particulars as they are presented to the eye in a picture, where the transcendent eminence of the heavenly bodies as they are, and especially of the sun, gives to this group a proper priority.

But this Creation Story may have an importance for us even greater than it had for the Hebrews, or than it could have in any of those ages when men believed, perhaps even too freely, in special modes of communication from the Deity to man, and had not a stock of courage or audacity enough to question the possibility of a Divine revelation. For we have now to bear in mind that the Book of Genesis generally contains a portion of human history, and that all human history is a record of human experience. It is not so with the introductory recital; for the contents of it lie outside of and anterior to the very earliest human experience. How came they then into the possession of a portion of mankind?

It is conceivable that a theory of Creation and of the ordering of the world might be bodied forth in poetry, or might under given circumstances be, as now, based on the researches of natural science.

But, in the first place, this recital cannot be due to the mere imagination of a poet. It is in a high degree, as we shall see, methodical and elaborate. And there is nothing either equalling or within many degrees approaching it, which can be set down to the account of poetry in other spheres of primitive antiquity, whatever their poetical faculty may have been. But the Hebrews do not appear to have cultivated or developed any poetical faculty at all, except that which was exhibited in strictly religious work, such as the devotions of the Psalms, and (principally) the discourses and addresses of the prophets.

As they were not, in a general sense, poetical, so neither were they in any sense scientific. By tradition and by positive records we know pretty well what kinds of knowledge were pursued in very early ages. They were most strictly practical. Take astronomy among the Chaldees, or medicine among the Egyptians. We may say with much confidence that there existed no science like geology, aiming to give a history of the earth. So there was no cosmogony, professing to convey a history of the *kosmos* as then understood, which may have included, with the earth, the sun, moon, stars, and atmosphere. When at a later date specula-

tion on physical origins began, it was rather on the primary idea than on any systematic arrangement or succession; nor had even the Greeks or Romans formulated any scheme in any degree approaching that of Genesis for order and method, so late as the time when they became acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures through their translation into Greek. There is not, then, the smallest ground for treating the Mosaic cosmogony as the offspring of scientific inquiry. To speak of it as guesswork would be irrational. There were no materials for guessing. There was no purpose to be served by guessing. For a record of the formation of the world we find no purpose in connection with the ordinary necessities or conveniences of life. Not to mention that down to this day there exists no cosmogony which can be called scientific, though there are theories both ingenious and beautiful which apparently are coming to be more and more accepted; these, however, being of decidedly late origin even in the history of modern physics.

But, further, as the Tale of Creation is not poetry, nor is it science, so neither, according to its own aspect or profession, is it theory at all. The method here pursued is that of historical recital. The person who composes or transmits it seems to believe, and to intend others to believe, that he is dealing with matters of fact. But these matters of fact were, from the nature of the case, altogether inaccessible to inquiry, and impossible to attain by our ordinary mental faculties of perception or reflection, inasmuch as they date before the creation of our race. If it is, as it surely professes to be, a serious conveyance of truth, it can only be a communication from the Most High; a communication to man and for the use of man, therefore in a form adapted to his mind and to his use. If, thus considered, it is true, then it carries stamped upon it the proof of a Divine revelation; an assertion which cannot commonly be asserted, from the nature of the contents, as to this or that minute portion of Scripture at large. If, when thus considered, it is not true, we have to consider what account of it we are in a condition to give. I cannot say that to me this appears an easy undertaking. "If," says Professor Dana, "it be true that the narration in Genesis has no support in natural science, it would have been better for its religious character that all the verses between the first and those on the creation of man had been omitted."*

But the truth, or trueness, of which I speak, is truth or trueness as conveyed to, and comprehended by, the mind of man, and further by the mind of man in a comparatively untrained and infant state. I cannot, indeed, wholly shut out from view the possibility that gradual imperfections may have crept into the record. Setting aside, however, that possibility, let us consider the conditions of the case as they are exhibited to us by reasonable likelihood; for, if the communication were divine, we may be certain that it would on that account be all the more strictly governed by the laws of the reasonable.

In an address* of singular ability on "The Discord and Harmony between Science and the Bible," Dr. Smith, of the University of Virginia, has drawn some very important distinctions. In the department of natural science, and in the department of scriptural record, the question lies "between the present interpretation of certain parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the present interpretation of certain parts of nature" (*Ibid.*, p. 3). "We must not too hastily assume that either of these interpretations is absolute and final." "The science of one epoch is to a large extent a help which the science of the next uses and abandons." Dr. Smith points out as an example, that down to the early part of the present century Newton's projectile theory of light seemed to be firmly established, but that it has given place to the theory of undulation, "which has now for fifty years reigned in its stead." Hence, he observes, we should not be too much elated by the discovery of harmonies, nor should we receive with impatience the assertion of contradictions. Throughout it is probable, and not demonstrative, evidence, with which we are dealing. There should always be a certain element of reserve in our judgments on particulars; yet probable evidence may come indefinitely near to demonstration, and, even as, while falling short of it, it may morally bind us to action, so may it, on precisely the same principles, bind us to belief. What we have to do is to deal with the evidence before us according to a rational appreciation of its force. It may show, on this or that particular question the concord, or it may show the discord, between alleged facts of nature and alleged interpretations of Scripture; or it may leave the question open for want of sufficient evidence, either way, on which to ground a conclusion.

* "Creation." [By Professor Dana, Oberlin, O., 1885. Page 322.]

* New York: Hatcham. The address is dated July 27, 1882.

It is by these principles, and under these limitations, that I desire to see the question tried in the terms in which I think it ought to be stated; namely, not whether the recitals in Genesis at each and every point have an accurately scientific form, but whether the statements of the Creation Story appear to stand in such a relation to the facts of natural science, so far as they have been ascertained, as to warrant or require our concluding that the statements have proceeded, in a manner above the ordinary manner, from the Author of the Creation itself.*

Those who maintain the affirmative of this proposition have by opponents been termed Reconcilers; and it is convenient, in a controverted matter, to have the power of reference, by a single word, to the proposers of any given opinion. The same rule of convenience may, perhaps, justify me in designating those who would assert the negative by the name of Contradictionists. The recorder of the Creation Story in Genesis I may designate by the name of the Mosaicist, or the Mosaic writer. This would not be reasonable if there were anything extravagant in the supposition that there is a groundwork of fact for the tradition which treats Moses as the author of the Pentateuch. But such a supposition, in whole or in part, is sustained by many and strong presumptions; and I bear in mind that Wellhausen, in his edition of Bleek, gives it as his opinion that there is a strong Mosaic element in the Pentateuch.

It does not seem too much to say that the conveyance of scientific instruction, as such, would not, under the circumstances of the case, be a reasonable object for the Mosaic writer to pursue; but that, on the other hand, it would be a reasonable object to convey to the mind of man, such as he actually was, a moral lesson drawn from and founded on that picture, that assemblage of created objects, which was before his eyes, and with which he lived in perpetual contact. We have, indeed, to consider both what lesson it would be most rational to convey, and by what method it would be most rational to stamp it as a living lesson on the mind by which it was to be received. And the question finally to be decided is not, whether, according to the present state of knowledge, the recital in the Book of Genesis is at each several point either pre-

cise or complete. It may here be general, there particular; it may here describe a continuous process, and it may there make large omissions, if the things omitted were either absolutely or comparatively immaterial to its purpose; it may be careful of the actual succession in time, or may deviate from it, according as the one or the other best subserved the general and principal aim; so that the true question, I must repeat, is this: Do the doctrines of the Creation Story in Genesis appear to stand in such a relation to the facts of natural science, so far as they are ascertained, as to warrant or require our concluding that the first proceeded, in a manner above the ordinary manner, from the Author of the visible creation?

What, then, may we conceive to have been the moral and spiritual lessons which the Mosaicist had to communicate, and not only to communicate, but to infuse or to impress? I venture on supposing that second to none among them would be these two: first, to teach man his proper place in creation in relation to its several orders, and thereby to prepare at least for the formation of the idea of relative duty as between man and other created beings; secondly, to exhibit to him, and by means of detail to make him know and feel, what was the beautiful and noble home that he inhabited, and with what a fatherly and tender care Providence had prepared it for him to dwell in. There was a picture before his eyes. That picture was filled with objects of nature, animate and inanimate. I say, one great aim may have been to make him know and feel by means of detail; for wholesale teaching, teaching in the lump, mostly ineffective even now, would have been preposterous then. It was needful to use the simplest phrases, that the primitive man might receive a conception, thoroughly faithful in broad outline, of what his Maker had been about on his behalf. So the Maker condescends to partition and set out his work in making the picture, and even—for this is the climax—to represent himself as resting after it; a declaration which is in no conflict with any scientific record, but which surely implies a license in the use of language never exceeded in any interpretation, reconciling or other, which has been applied to any part of the text of Genesis, and which draws its warrant wholly from the strong educative lesson that is to be learned from it.

It seems also probable that the Creation Story was intended to have a special bearing on the great institution of the day of

* See the attractive paper of Professor Pritchard, in his "Occasional Thoughts," Murray, 1889. He says, on page 351, "I cannot accept the Proem as being, or even as intended to be, an exact and scientific account of Creation," but adds that it "contains within it elements of that same sort of superhuman aid or superintendence which is generally understood by the undefined term of inspiration."

rest, or Sabbath, by exhibiting it in the manner of an object lesson. Paley, indeed, has said that God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it (Gen. ii. 3), not at that time, but for that reason. He is a writer much to be respected, but this opinion cannot, I think, now be followed; especially since we have learned from Assyrian researches how many and how sharply traced are the vestiges of some early institution or command which in that region evidently gave a special sanctity to the number seven, and, in particular, to the seventh day.

Man then, childlike and sinless, had to receive a lesson such as this: It has not been by a slight or single effort that the nature in which you are moulded has been lifted to its present level; you have reached it by steps and degrees, and by a plan which, stated in rough outline, may stir your faculties, and help them onwards to the truth through the genial action of wonder, delight, and gratitude. This was a lesson, as it seems to me, perhaps quite large enough for the primitive man on the facts of creation, and one after hearing and digesting which he too might reasonably rest for generations. And it seems to me to have been vital to the efficiency of this lesson that it should have been sharply broken up into parts, although there might be in nature nothing, at the precise points of breakage or transition, to correspond with those divisions. They would become intelligible, significant, and useful on a comparison between the several processes in their developed state, and of the vast and measureless differences which in that state they severally present to contemplation. As, when a series of scenes are now made to move along before the eye of a spectator, his attention is not fixed upon the joints which divide them, but on the scenes themselves, yet the joints constitute a framework, as it were, for each, and the idea of each is made more distinct and lively than it would have been if without any note of division they had run into one another.

In order, then, to approach any attempt at comparison between the record of Scripture and the record of natural science, we must consider first, as far as reasonable presumption carries us, what is the object of the scientist, and what was the object of the Mosaic or Mosaic writer in the first chapter of Genesis.

The object of the scientist is simply to state the facts of nature in the cosmogony as he finds them. The object of the Mosaic writer is broadly distinct; it is, surely, to convey moral and spiritual training. This

training was to be conveyed to human beings of child-like temperament and of unproved understanding. It was his business to use those words which would best convey the lessons he had to teach, which would carry *most truth* into the minds of those taught. In speaking of the Mosaic writer, I would, without presumption, seek to include any divine impulse which may have prompted him, or may have dictated any communication from God to man, in whatever form it may have been conveyed. With this aim in view, words of figure, though literally untrue, might carry more truth home than words of fact; and words less exact will even now often carry more truth than words more exact. The truth to be conveyed was, indeed, in its basis physical, but it was to serve moral and spiritual ends, and accordingly by these ends the method of its conveyance behooved to be shaped and pictured.

I submit, then, that the days of creation are neither the solar days of twenty-four hours, nor are they the geological periods which the geologist himself is compelled popularly, and in a manner utterly remote from precision, to describe as millions upon millions of years. To use such language as this is simply to tell us that we have no means of forming a determinate idea upon the subject of the geologic periods. I set aside both these interpretations, as I do not think the Mosaicist intended to convey an idea like the first, which was false, or like the second, which would have been barren and unmeaning. Unmeaning, and even confusing in the highest degree; for large statements in figures are well known to be utterly beyond comprehension for man at an early intellectual stage; and I have myself, I think, shown* that, even among the Achaian or Homeric Greeks, the limits of numerical comprehension were extremely narrow, and all large numbers were used, so to speak, at a venture. It seems to me that the days of the Mosaicist are more properly to be described as CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF THE CREATION. That is to say, the purpose of the writer in speaking of the days was the same as the purpose of the historian is when he divides his work into chapters. His object is to give clear and sound instruction. So that he can do this, and in order that he may do it, the periods of time assigned to each chapter are longer or shorter according as the one or the other may minister to better comprehension of his subject by his readers. Further, in point of chronology, his chapters often over-

* "Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age," Vol. III., Section on Number.

lap. He finds it needful, always keeping his end in view, to pursue some narrative to its close, and then, stepping backwards, to take up some other series of facts, although their exordium dated at a period of time which he has already traversed. The resources of the literary art, aided for the last four centuries by printing, enable the modern writer to confront more easily these difficulties of arrangement, and so to present the material to his reader's eye, in text or margin, as to place the texture of his chronology in harmony with the texture of the action he has to relate. The Mosaicist, in his endeavor to expound the orderly development of the visible world, had no such resources. His expedient was to lay hold on that which to the mind of his time was the best example of complete and orderly division. This was the day, an idea at once simple, definite, and familiar. As one day is divided from another not by any change visible to the eye at a given moment, yet effectually by the broad chasm of the intervening night, so were the stages of the creative work several and distinct, even if, like the lapse of time, they were without breach of continuity. Each had its work, each had the beginning and the completion of that work, even as the day is begun by its morning, and completed and concluded by its evening.

And now to sum up. In order that the narrative might be intelligible, it was useful to subdivide the work. This could most effectively be done by subdividing it into periods of time. And further, it was well to choose that circumscription or period of time which is the most definite. Of these the day is clearly the best, as compared with the month or the year,—first, because of its small and familiar compass; and, secondly, because of the strong and marked division which separates one day from another.

Hence, we may reasonably argue, it is that not here only, but throughout the Scripture, and even down to the present time in familiar human speech, the day is figuratively used to describe periods of time, perfectly undefined as such, but defined, for practical purposes, by the lives or events to which reference is made. And if it be said there was a danger of its being misunderstood in this particular case, the answer is that such danger of misapprehension attaches in various degrees to all use of figurative language; but figurative language is still used. And with reason, because the mischiefs arising from such danger are rare and trivial, in comparison with the force and clearness which it lends to truth on its

passage through a clouded atmosphere of folly, indifference, and prejudice, into the mind of man. In this particular case the danger and inconvenience are at their minimum, the benefit at its zenith; for no moral mischief ensues because some have supposed the days of the creation to be pure solar days of twenty-four hours, while the benefit has been that the grand conception of orderly development, and ascent from chaos to man, became among the Hebrew people a universal and familiar truth, of which other races appear to have lost sight.

I may now part from the important and long-vexed discussion on the Mosaic days. But I shall further examine the general question, what is the true method, what the reasonable spirit, of interpretation to be applied to the words of the Creation Story? I will state frankly my opinion that in this important matter too much has sometimes been conceded in modern days to the scientist and to the Hebraist, just as in former days too much was allowed to the unproved assumptions of the theologian. Now it is evident that the proper ground of the scientist and of the Hebraist respectively is unassailable as against those who are neither scientists nor Hebraists. On the meaning of the words used in the Creation Story, I, as an ignoramus, have only to accept the statements of Hebrew scholars, with gratitude for the aid received, and in like manner those of men skilled in natural science on the nature and succession of the orders of being, and the transitions from one to the other. Not that their statements are inerrable; but they constitute the best working material in our possession. Still they are the statements of men whose title to speak with authority is confined to their special province; and if we allow them without protest to go beyond it, and still to claim that authority beyond their own borders, we are much to blame, and may suffer for our carelessness.

I will now endeavor to illustrate and apply what has been said. The Hebraist says, I will conduct you safely (as far as the case allows) to the meaning of the Hebrew words. And the scientist makes the same promise in regard to the facts of the created orders, so far as they are exhibited by geological investigations into the crust of the earth. At first sight it may seem as if these two authoritative witnesses must cover the whole ground, each setting out from his own point of departure, the two then meeting in the midst, and leaving no unoccupied space between them. But my contention is that there is a ground which neither of them is

entitled to occupy in his character as a specialist, and on which he has no warrant for entering, except in so far as he is a just observer and reasoner in a much wider field. And what is the subject-matter still to be disposed of? Not the meaning of the Hebrew words. The Hebraist has already given us their true equivalents in English. We know, for example, that the "whales" of Genesis i. 21 are not whales at all, but that they are aquatic monsters or great creatures; while we learn from the biologist that the whale is a late mammal. So geology has acquainted us what are the relative dates of the water and of the land populations, and has supplied much information as to reptiles, birds, and beasts. But there remains a great uncovered ground and a great unsolved question. It is this. Given the facts as the geologist is led to state them, given the Hebrew tongue as the instrument through which the relator has to work, what are the terms, and what is the order and adjustment of terms, through which he can convey most of truth and force, with least of encumbrance and of impediment, to the mind of man in the condition in which he had to deal with it? Let me be permitted to say that the only specialism that can be of the smallest value here is that of the close observer of human nature; of the student of human action, and of the methods which divine Providence employs in the circuit of its dealings with men. Certainly I can lay no claim to be heard here more than any other person. Yet will I say, that any man whose labor and duty for several scores of years has included as their central point the study of the means of making himself intelligible to the mass of men, is in a far better position to judge what would be the forms and methods of speech proper for the Mosaic writer to adopt, than the most perfect Hebraist as such, or the most consummate votary of natural sciences as such.

I will now endeavor to try some portions of the case which turn upon verbal difficulty. At the outset of the narrative the relator says that "the earth was without form and void" (Gen. i. 2), and that "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." But how is this? says the Hebraist. The Hebrew word for earth means earth, and the word used for water never means anything except water. But, according to the beautiful theory which has of late won so largely the adhesion of the scientific world, and which seems to be mainly called the nebular theory, at the commencement of the process which Genesis describes, and

in its early stages, there was no earth, and there were no waters. Is the relator here really at fault? It seems to me that it might be as easy to cavil at the phrase nebular theory, though it be one in use among scientific men, as it is to find fault with these words of Genesis; for we seem to have for our point of departure a time when all the elements and all the forces of the visible universe were in chaotic mixture, whereas there could hardly be a *nebula*, or vaporous cloud, until they had begun to be disengaged from one another. How, then, are we to judge of the use of the word "earth" by the Mosaic writer? Is it not thus? He is dealing with an Adam, or with a primitive race of men, who have the earth under their eyes. He wants to give them an idea of its coming into existence. And he says what we may fairly paraphrase in this way: that which has now become earth, and was then becoming earth, the solid, well-defined form you see, was as yet without form and void; epithets which, I am told, might be improved upon, but this is a matter by the way.

So again with respect to water. The men for whom the relator wrote knew, perhaps, of no fluid except water, at any rate of none vast and practically measureless in volume. What was the idea he had to convey? It was not the special and distinctive character of the liquid called water; it was the broad separation between solid as such, familiar, firm, immovable under his feet, and fluid as such, movable and fluctuating at large in space. No doubt the idea conveyed by the word "waters" is an imperfect idea, although waters are still waters at times when they may be holding vast quantities of solid in solution. But it was an idea easy, clear, and familiar up to the point of expressing forcibly the contrast between the ancient state of things, with its weltering waste, and the recent and defined conditions of the habitable earth. Could we ask of the relator more than that he should employ, among the words at his disposal, that which would best convey a true idea? And had he any word so good as "water" for his purpose, though it was but an approximation to the actual fact? Dr. Driver describes the scene as that of a "surging chaos." An admirable phrase, I make no doubt, for our modern and cultivated minds, but a phrase which, in my judgment, would have left the pupils of the Mosaic writer exactly in the condition out of which it was his purpose to bring them; namely, a state of utter ignorance and total darkness, with possibly a little ruffle of bewilderment to boot.

Another
is, an
eous
same
is on
that
can c
ess by
in o
medl
beca
into
who
the r
child
and
good
had
stan
gen
emp
tem
I
tion
tra
into
for
par
my
wa
dit
tex
jec
cal
tic
th
an
th
qu
de
pr
je
th
sc
st
si
g
c
h
d

Another description claiming high authority is, an "uncompounded, homogeneous, gaseous condition" of matter,—to which the same observation will apply. Even now, it is only by rude and bald approximations that the practised intellects of our scientists can convey a conception of the actual process by which *chaos* passed into *kosmos*, or, in other words, confusion became order, medley became sequence, seeming anarchy became majestic law, and horror softened into beauty. Before censuring the Mosaist, who had to deal with grown children, let the adverse critic try his hand upon a little child. I believe he will find that the method and language of this relator are not only good, but superlatively good, for the aim he had in view if once for all we get rid of standards of interpretation other than the genuine and just one, which tests the means employed by their relation to the end contemplated.

I now approach a larger head of objection, which is usually handled by the Contradictionists in a tone of confidence rising into the pæan of triumph. But let me, before presuming to touch on objections to particulars of the Creation Story, guard myself against being supposed to put forward any portion of what follows as unconditional assertion, or final comment on the text. The general situation is this: Objectors do not hesitate to declare dogmatically that the Great Chapter is in contradiction with the laws and facts of nature, and that attempts to reconcile them are futile and irrational. It is thus sought to close the question. My aim is to show that the question is not closed, and that the condemnation pronounced upon the Mosaist is premature. For this purpose I offer conjecturally, and in absolute submission to all that biology and geology, or other forms of science, have established, replies which are strictly provisional, but replies which I consider that the Contradictionist ought, together with other and weightier replies, to confute or legitimately to consider before he can be warranted in asserting the contradiction. But I proceed.

How hopeless is the cry to reconcile Genesis with fact, when, as a fact, the sun is the source of light, and yet, in Genesis, light is the work of the first day, and vegetation of the third, while sun, moon, and stars appear only on the fourth! Nay, worse still. Whereas the morning and the evening depend wholly on the motion of the earth round the sun, the Mosaist is so ignorant that he gives us not days only, but the morning and the evening of days before

the sun is created. And so his narration explodes, not by blows aimed at it from without, but by its own internal self-contradictions. It is hissed, like a blundering witness, out of court.

The first triad of days, says Professor Dana ("Creation," p. 207), sets forth the events connected with the inorganic history of the earth. The second triad, from the fourth day to the sixth, is occupied with the events of the organic history, from the creation of the first animal to man. He finds in the general structure of the narrative a considerable degree of elaboration, an arrangement full of art. The passage from verse 14 to verse 19 is in one sense a qualification of the order he thinks to have been laid down, inasmuch as the heavenly bodies belong to the inorganic division of the history. From another point of view, however, this arrangement contributes in a marked manner to the symmetry of the narrative. The first triad of days begins with the first and gradual detachment of light from the "surging chaos;" the second, at the stage in which light had reached its final distribution. The central mass had assumed with regularity its spherical and luminous figure, after shedding off from itself the minor masses, each to find for itself its own orbit of rotation. Or, if we are to assume that the photosphere or light envelope of the earth itself had obstructed the vision of the sun, we have, further, to assume* that this obstacle had now disappeared, and the visibility of the sun was established. So that light, or the light-power, while diffused, ushers in the first division of the mighty process; the same light-power, concentrated by the operation of the rotatory principle, and for practical purposes become such as we now know it, is placed at the head of the second division, the division that deals with organic life.

It is remarkable that the subject of light is the only one which is dealt with in two separate sections of the narrative. The gradual severance, or disengagement, of the earth from its vesture, the atmosphere, and of the solid land from the ocean, are continuously handled in verses 6-10. Each of the processes is summed up into its grand result, as if it had been a violent, convulsive, instantaneous act. The avoidance of all attempt to explain the process seems to me only a proof of the wisdom which guided the formation of the tale. To the primitive man it would have become a barren puzzle; the wood must have been lost in

* Guyot, "Creation," X., p. 92.

the trees. As it now stands, mental confusion is avoided, and definite ideas are conveyed.

There seems, however, to be a special reason for the introduction of the heavenly bodies at this particular place. It was evidently needful at some place or other to give a specific account of the day, or compartment of time, which is employed to mark the severance of the different stages of creation from each other. At what point of the narrative could this account be most properly and most accurately introduced? In order to answer this question, let us consider the situation rather more at large.

The supposition is, that we set out with a seething mass that contains all the elements which are to become the solids and liquids, the moist and dry, the heat and the non-heat or cold, the light and the non-light or darkness, that so largely determine the external conditions of our present existence. By degrees, as, according to the rarity or density of parts, the centripetal or the centrifugal force prevails, the huge bulk of the sun consolidates itself in the centre, and aggregations of matter (rings, according to Guyot,* which afterward become spheres), are detached from it to form the planets, under the agency of the same mechanical forces; all or some of them, in their turn, dismissing from their as yet ill-compacted surfaces other subaltern masses to revolve around them as satellites, or otherwise to take their course in space. Meantime, the great cooling process, which is still in progress at this day, has begun, and proceeds at a rate determined for it by its particular conditions, among which mass and motion are of essential consequence; for, other things being equal, a small body will cool faster and a large body will cool slower; and a body moving more rapidly through space of a lower temperature than its own will cool more rapidly; while one which is stationary, or which diffuses heat less rapidly from its surface into the colder space, will retain a high temperature longer. Owing to these or other causes, the temperature of the earth-surface has been adapted to the conditions of human life, and of the more recent animal life, for a very long time; to those of the earlier animals, and of vegetation in its different orders, for we know not how much longer; while the sun, though gradually losing some part of his stock of caloric, still remains at a temperature inordinately high.

Considering, then, what are the relations

between the conditions of heat and those of moisture, and how the coatings of vapor—"the swaddling-band of cloud"—might affect the visibility of bodies, may it not be rash to affirm that the sun is, as a definite and compact body, older than the earth? or that the Mosaicist might not properly treat the visibility of the sun, in its present form, as best marking for man the practical inception of his existence? or that, with heat, light, soil, and moisture ready to its service, primordial vegetation might not exist on the surface of a planet like the earth, before the sun had fully reached his matured condition of compact, material, well-defined figure, and of visibility to the eye? May not, in short, the establishment of the relation of visibility between earth and sun be the most suitable point for the relator in Genesis to bring the two into connection? And here again I would remind the reader that the Mosaic days may be chapters in a history; and that not in despite of the law of series, but with a view to its best practicable application, the chapters of a history may overlap.

The priority of earth to sun, as given in the narrative, carries us as far as this, that vegetative work (of what kind I shall presently inquire) was proceeding on the surface of the earth before any relation of earth with sun is declared. It is then declared in the terms, "And God made two great lights" (v. 16). Now the making of earth is nowhere declared, but only implied. And who shall say that there is some one exact point of time in the continuous process which (according to the nebular theory) reaches from the first beginning of rotation down to the present condition of the solar system, to which point, and to which alone, the term "making" must belong? But, unless there be such a point, it seems very difficult to convict the Mosaic writer of error in the choice he has made of an opportunity for introducing the heavenly bodies into his narrative.

I suppose that no apology is needed for his mentioning the moon and the stars as accessories in the train of the sun, and combining them all without note of time, although their several "makings" may have proceeded at different speeds. But here again we find exhibited that principle of relativity to man and his uses, by which the writer in Genesis appears so wisely to steer his course. We are told of "two great lights" (v. 16); and one of them is the moon. The formation of the stars is inter-

* "Creation," pp. 67, 73.

* Dana, "Creation," p. 210.

jected soon after, as if comparatively insignificant. But the stars individually are in themselves far greater and more significant than the moon, which is denominated a great light. In what sense is the moon a great light? Only in virtue of its relation to us. So, then, the general upshot is, that the mention of the sun is introduced at that point in the cosmogonic process when, from the condition of our form and atmosphere, or of his, or of both, he had become so definite and visible as to be finally efficient for his office of dividing day from day, and year from year; that the planets, being of an altogether secondary importance, simply appear as his attendant company; and that to the moon, a body in itself comparatively insignificant, is awarded a rather conspicuous place which, if objectively considered, is out of proportion, but which at once falls into line when we acknowledge relativity as the basis of the narrative, by reason of the great importance of the functions which this satellite discharges on behalf of the inhabitants of the earth.

Next, it is alleged that we have days with an evening and a morning before we have a sun to supply a measure of time for them. Doubtless there could be no approach to anything like an evening and a morning, so long as light was uniformly diffused. But under the nebular theory, the work of the first day implies an initial concentration of light; and, from the time when light began to be thus powerfully concentrated, would there not be an evening and a morning, though imperfect, for any revolving solid of the system, according as it might be turned toward, or from, the centre of the highest luminosity?

But we have not yet emerged from the net of the Contradictionist, who lays hold on the vegetation verses (vs. 11, 12) to impeach the credit of the Creation Story. The objection here becomes twofold. First, we have vegetation anterior to the sun; and, secondly, this is not merely an aquatic vegetation for the support of aquatic life, nor merely a rude and primordial vegetation such as that of and before the coal-measures, but a vegetation complete and absolute, including fern-grass, then the herb-yielding seed, and, lastly, the fruit-tree, yielding fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself. Here is the food of mammals and of man provided, when neither of them was created, or was about to exist, until after many a long antecedent stage of lower life had found its way into creation and undertaken its office there.

First, as regards vegetation before the

sun's performance of his present function in the heavens is announced. There were light and heat, atmosphere with its conditions of moist and dry, soil prepared to do its work in nutrition. Can there be ground for saying that, with such provision made, vegetation could not take place? Let us, for argument's sake, suppose that the sun could now recede into an earlier condition, could go back by some few stages of that process through which he became our sun; his material less compact, his form less well defined, his rays more intercepted by the "swaddling band" of cloud and vapor. Vegetation might be modified in character, but must it therefore cease? May we not say that a more violent paradox would have been exhibited, and a sounder objection would have lain, had the Mosaic writer failed to present to us at least an initial vegetation before the era at which the sun had fully obtained the definite spherical form, and the conditions for the transmission of his rays had reached substantially their present state?

But then, it is fairly observed that the vegetation as described is not preparatory and initial, but full-formed, and that any tracing of vegetation anterior to life in the strata is ambiguous and obscure. In the age of Protozoa, the earliest living creatures, the indications of plants are not determinable, according to the high authority of Sir J. W. Dawson. It is observed by Canon Driver "that the proof from science of the existence of plants before animals is inferential and *à priori*."* Guyot holds a directly contrary opinion, and says the present remains indicate a large presence of infusorial protophytes in the early seas.† But let the point be conceded. Undoubtedly all *à priori* assumptions ought, in inquiries of this kind, to be watched with the utmost vigilance and jealousy. Still there are limits beyond which vigilance and jealousy cannot push their claims. Is there anything strange in the supposition that the comparatively delicate composition of the first vegetable structures should have given way and become indiscernible to us, amid the shock and pressure of firmer and more durable material? The flesh of the mammoth has, indeed, been preserved to us, and eaten by dogs in our own time, coming down from ages which we have no means of measuring; but then it was not exposed to the same pressure, and subsisted under conditions of temperature which were adequately antiseptic.

* "The Cosmogony of Genesis," in *The Expositor*, January, 1886, p. 29.

† "Creation," X., p. 90.

tic. But has all palæozoic life been ascertained by its flesh, or do we not owe our knowledge of many among the earlier forms of animated life to their osseous structures? And, in cases where only bone remains, is it an extravagant use of argument *à priori* to hold that there must have been flesh also? And, if flesh, why not vegetable matter? Canon Driver, indeed, observes* that from a very early date animals preyed upon animals. Still the first animal could not prey upon himself; there must have been vegetable *pabulum* out of which an animal body was first constructed. "Before the beasts," says Sir George Stokes, "came the plants, plants which are necessary for their sustenance."†

Next, with respect to the objection that the vegetation of the eleventh and twelfth verses is a perfected vegetation, and that there existed no such vegetation before animal life began. But why are we to suppose that the Mosaic writer intended to say such a vegetation did exist before animal life began? For no other reason than this: having mentioned the first introduction of vegetable life, he carries it on without breaking his narrative to its completion. In so proceeding, he does exactly what the historian does when, for the sake of clearer comprehension, he brings one series of events from its inception to its close, although in order of time the beginning only, and not the completion, belongs to the epoch at which he introduces it. What I have called the rule of relativity, the intention, namely, to be intelligible to man, seems to show the reason of his arrangement. If his meaning was, "the beautiful order of trees, plants, and grasses which you see around you had its beginnings in the era when living creatures were about to commence their movements in the waters and on the earth, and all this was a part of the fatherly work of God on your behalf"—such meaning was surely well expressed, expressed after a sound and workmanlike fashion, in the text of the Creation Story as it stands.

I will next notice the objection that the Mosaic writer takes (according to the received version) no notice of the great age of reptiles, but passes at once from the creation of marine animals (v. 20) to the fowl that may "fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." He thus passes over without notice the amphibians, the reptiles proper, the insects, and the marsupial or early mammals, on his way to the birds. It is added that he brackets the birds with the

fishes, and thus makes them of the same date.

It is requisite here to observe, with respect to birds, that Professor Dana* writes of the narrative in Genesis as follows: "The accordance is exact with the succession made out for the earliest species of these grand divisions, if we except the division of birds, about which there is doubt."

Owen, however, in his "Palæontology,"† places animal life in six orders; namely:

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------|
| 1. Invertebrates. | 4. Birds. |
| 2. Fishes. | 5. Mammals. |
| 3. Reptiles. | 6. Man. |

In the more recent "Manual" of Professor Prestwich (1886), the order of seniority stands as follows:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Cryptogamous Plants. | 4. Mammals. |
| 2. Fishes. | 5. Man. |
| 3. Birds. | |

In the "Manual"† of Etheridge we are supplied with the following series, after fishes: 1. Fossil reptiles. 2. Ornithosauria: "*Flying animals, which combined the character of reptiles with those of birds.*" 3. The first birds of the secondary rocks, with "feathers in all respects similar to those of existing birds." 4. Mammals.

It thus appears that much turns on the definition of a bird, and that it is hard, on the evidence thus presented, seriously to impeach the character of the Creation Story. Largely viewed, the place of birds, as an order in creation, is given us by our scientific teachers, or by many among them, between fishes and the bulk of mammals. It is a gratuitous assumption that the Mosaicist intends to assign to them the same date as fishes; he places them in the same day, but then we have to bear in mind that he more than once gives several actions to the same day. He sets them after the fishes; and the fairer construction surely is, not that they were contemporaneous, but that they were subsequent. He forbears, it is true, to notice amphibious reptiles, insects, and marsupials. And why? All these, variously important in themselves, fill no large place, some of them no place at all, in the view and in the concerns of primitive man; and, having man for his object, he forbears, on his guiding principle of relativity, to encumber his narrative with them.

If it be true that the demarcation of the order of birds in creation is less sharply drawn than that (for example) of fishes and of mammals, may we not be permitted to

* "Creation," as before, p. 215.

† Second edition, 1861, p. 5.

‡ "Phillips's Manual of Geology," Part II., by R. Etheridge, F.R.S., Chap. XXV., pp. 511-520.

* The Expositor, p. 29.

† Letter to Mr. Elluin, August 14, 1888.

trace a singular propriety in the diminution, so to speak, of emphasis with which the Mosaicist gives to their introduction a more qualified emphasis, by simply subjoining them (v. 20) to the aquatic creation?

I have now made bold to touch on the principal objections popularly known. They run into details which it has not been possible fully to notice, but which seem to have no force, except what they derive from the illegitimate process of holding down the Mosaic writer in his narration, so short, so simple, so sublime, by restraints which the ordinary historian, though he has plenty of auxiliary expedients, and is under no restraint of space, finds himself obliged to shake off, if he wishes to be understood. On the introduction of the great or recent mammals, and of man, as the objector is silent, I remain silent also.

It would be uncandid, however, not to notice the "creeping thing" of verses 24, 25, and 26. In these verses the "creeping thing" is distinguished from cattle, and undoubtedly appears upon the scene as if it were a formation wholly new. If the Mosaicist really intended to convey that this was the first appearance of the creeping thing in creation, there is, I suppose, no doubt that he is at war with the firmly established witness of natural science. Guyot, indeed, says* that these creeping things are not reptiles, but are the smaller mammals, rats, mice, and the like. If, however, the common rendering be maintained, it may be just worth while to suggest a possible explanation. It is as follows: "These creeping things were a very minor fact for creation, so that the purpose of the relator, and the relative importance of the facts, may here, as elsewhere, govern his mode of handling them. It is fit to be observed that he never mentions insects at all,—as if they were too insignificant to find a place among the larger items of his account, as if he selected his materials, and sifted off the less important of them. And there does seem to be some license or looseness in his method of treating these creeping things; for while he severs them from fish, fowl, and beast, in the verses I have named, and, again, in verse 30, from fowl and from beast, yet in verse 28, when the great charter of dominion is granted to man, he sums up in three divisions only, and makes man the lord "over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Reptiles appear to have passed out of his view, either wholly,

or so far as not to deserve separate mention; and it may seem likely that he did not think their importance such as to call for a particular and defined place, and did not mean to give them such a place, in the chronological order of creation.

If, on the whole, such be a fair statement of arguments and results, we may justly render our thanks to Dana, Guyot,* Dawson, Stokes, and other scientific authorities, who seem to find no cause for supporting the broad theory of contradiction. I am well aware of my inability to add an atom of weight to their judgments. Yet I have ventured to attempt applying to this great case what I hold to be the just laws of a narrative intended to instruct and to persuade, and thus finding a key to the true construction of the chapter. For myself, I cannot but at present remain before and above all things impressed with the profound and marvellous wisdom which has guided the human instrument, whether it were pen or tongue, which was first commissioned from on high, to hand onward for our admiration and instruction this wonderful, this unparalleled relation. And I submit to my readers that my words were not wholly idle words, when, without presuming to lay down any universal and inflexible proposition, and without questioning any single contention of persons specially qualified, I said that the true question was whether the words of the Mosaic writer, taken as a whole, do not stand, according to our present knowledge, in such a relation to the facts of nature as to warrant and require thus far the conclusion that the Ordainer of Nature, and the Giver or Guide of the Creation Story, are one and the same.

London, England.

THE CENTRAL COUNCIL REFUSE TO ENFORCE A CREED-CONDITION OF MEMBERSHIP UPON THE ORDER OF THE KING'S DAUGHTERS.

From *The Churchman* (Episcopalian), New York, April 19, 1890.

To the Editor of *THE CHURCHMAN* :

ON reading the article published in *THE CHURCHMAN* of March 29, entitled "Central Council of the King's Daughters Dis-

* In the Preface to Guyot's "Creation" will be found some account of the recent literature of his subject. I must also mention a valuable pamphlet entitled "The Higher Criticism," by Mr. Rust, Rector of Westerfield, Suffolk. It sets forth the scope of the negative criticism, and recommends (p. 30) to "have patience for a while, and wait to see the issue."

* "Creation," p. 120.

vided," we feel it to be incumbent upon us, who now constitute the "Central Council," to make plain to the public the position which we maintain concerning membership in the order of "The King's Daughters." We would state that the Central Council is composed of women who, without exception, entertain Trinitarian views. Hence it is apparent that the differences of opinion among us were not founded upon variance in belief. We differed only in judgment as to the requirements which should be exacted of persons desiring to enter the Order. The question was briefly the following:

"Should persons desiring to enter the Order be admitted only on their avowed acceptance of the so-called Apostles' Creed, or should their desire to unite in work with us be recognized as an acknowledgment of their love to God and their wish to serve In His Name?"

The Council decided that their responsibility was to God and not to the Council, and that each soul must decide for itself whether it held such a relation to Christ as would justify its entrance into our ranks. This was in exact accordance with our Constitution, which expressly admits all "who hold themselves responsible to the King, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

In deciding that no creed conditions of membership should be adopted, the Council recognized that to the Church belongs the power to formulate and to demand adherence to creeds. It did not feel itself empowered to assume church prerogatives, but desired its members to be guided theologically by their chosen rectors and pastors. It did not establish new work, but identified itself everywhere with Church labors and interests. And, while we know that the various Christian activities in the churches have been increased through the efforts of the Order, we have also seen by its influence many wavering souls won to allegiance to Christ. For such seeking souls we have not dared to enforce conditions more exclusive in effect than were those imposed by the Lord upon His chosen apostles. To them He said, "Follow me." Taking the Lord's teaching as the guide of the Order, we have invited all persons who recognize their responsibility to Him, and were willing to follow Him, to join us in various forms of service undertaken in His name.

Our Constitution embodies the above thought in its article of membership, and the growing usefulness of the Order, and the increase of spiritual life among the members, testify to its acceptance by God as an agency for good to His creatures.

The religious attitude of the Order of The King's Daughters is to-day exactly what it was in the beginning of its existence, nor have its articles of membership been modified to meet the demand of any denomination.

A great injustice is expressed by your correspondent in the article of March 29, both to the Unitarians and to the Central Council. We quote: "A number of Unitarian ladies in Boston protested against the evangelical attitude of the Central Council." On this point, truth compels us to say that no such protest was ever received by the Council. One Unitarian, representing others (we do not know how many), sent to the Council a letter of inquiry so noble in spirit and word as to be a model for us all. In this letter it is expressly stated that they, our few Unitarian members who had come to us in the beginning, had "always recognized that the Council was evangelical; and that they did not wish to see their views adopted or endorsed by the Council." They only desired to know if we had decided to thrust out, or to refuse thereafter to admit, any who did not hold our own view of the Ever Blessed Trinity.

They never hinted at a desire for us to change from our recognized evangelical basis. On the contrary, they said, "The original basis is more than grand. It is the highest lesson of Christian charity the world has ever seen. It respects the individual conviction of its members, yet unites all in the following of the Master."

Your correspondent continues: "To satisfy them (the Unitarians) the Constitution must be interpreted in an unevangelical sense, and all literature inconsistent with such interpretation must be suppressed."

Now the resolution to amend the leaflets in circulation was not passed to satisfy any complainants, neither was it formed, as THE CHURCHMAN states, "in compliance with Unitarian requests," since no Unitarian ever made such request. But a statement in one of the leaflets seemed to claim the right to put out, or to refuse to admit, members who did not accept the theological views of the Council. This leaflet, offered in the early days of the Order, was allowed to pass into its literature unquestioned, since it embodied the Council's views, but with no thought of its being considered an attempt to thrust a creed condition of membership upon an Order already formed on the simple basis of love and service in the Name of Christ. When we found it being interpreted as an official assumption of authority, the leaflet was carefully and prayerfully considered,

with the result expressed in the following resolution: "Whereas, the Order of 'The King's Daughters' has been the outgrowth of the union and co-operation of persons who, without regard to theological differences of belief, have held in common the desire, in the name and for the love of Christ, to serve the world by the development of spiritual life and the promotion of Christian activity; therefore,

Resolved, That, although the members of the Central Council, individually, accept the 'Apostles' Creed,' they have no authority to require from others, as a condition of membership in the Order, adherence to any formulated creed or to any special theological tenet; such an act being foreign to the spirit of the Order and inconsistent with its origin and purpose, as stated in the first and second circulars, which were the invitation of the Central Council to the women of the world to unite with them to do the Master's work.

"And that it be forever understood by persons now associated in the Order, and by those who may hereafter desire to join its numbers, that the Order of 'The King's Daughters' is a Christian Sisterhood of Service, actuated by love to the King, but bound together by no required formula of doctrinal faith. And be it further

Resolved, That all or any literature provided by the Central Council for the use of the Order, which commits its members to the acceptance of a formulated creed or to a specially stated theological doctrine, be immediately amended by the Committee on Publication or withdrawn from circulation.

"Christ, not dogma, shall be the teaching of the Order.

"Mrs. Margaret Bottome, president; Miss Kate Bond, vice-president; Mrs. Mary L. Dickinson, general secretary; Miss Georgia H. Libby, treasurer; Mrs. Isabella Charles Davis, corresponding secretary; Miss Margaret Barker; Mrs. Grace Ruggles.

"N. B.—Twelve votes cast: seven yeas, five nays."

Examination of the leaflet quoted by your correspondent will show distinctly that "the foundation upon which the Order rests is Jesus Christ our Lord," in whose name and by whose power and to whose glory all our work is done. The sentences omitted from this leaflet did not, in the opinion of the Central Council, accord with our Constitutional position, and were therefore stricken out.

The article in *THE CHURCHMAN* again makes an incorrect statement with regard to our non-creed declaration. It says:

"Notwithstanding this protest, the work of the Central Council of transferring the Order from an evangelical to a Unitarian platform went on." We positively assert that the Order of The King's Daughters stands to-day where it has stood from the beginning. No member of the present Central Council has at any time desired to change its platform. Personal responsibility, loyal allegiance and loving service to the King, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, has always been its teaching, and neither the Council, nor the members of the Order, have desired to build upon any other foundation. The agitation in the Central Council was from within and not from without, and the only change proposed was a transference of the Order from its broad foundation, Jesus Christ alone, to a foundation of theological tenet and dogma. The Central Council has "neither transferred itself, nor the Order, from an evangelical to a Unitarian platform," but it did and does refuse to arrogate to itself the authority to enforce any creed condition of membership upon the Order, or to constitute itself the judge of the relationship of any soul to God.

We learn further, by *THE CHURCHMAN*, "that every effort was made by the Protestants to re-establish the Order upon a position deserving the sanction and co-operation of evangelical pastors and the religious press."

We can only reply that efforts to re-establish that which had never been moved from its foundation would naturally fail; and that both pastors and press seem to have waited for such attacks as that of your correspondent to open their eyes to the "undeserving" character of our work. It is only just to state that no less than four of the seven who signed the protest unite with the resolutionists in characterizing the attack as "misleading and liable to produce false impressions"—and in declaring it "to have been made without their knowledge or consent." Indeed, notwithstanding their difference in opinion, so great has been the respect and affection of these members of the Council for each other, and so great their mutual love for the work, that any effort to injure or destroy it should not be attributed to them, surprising and sad as it seems to find such effort made on the same page that calls our "Christian lives and beliefs pure, true and beautiful," and "values the privileges of uniting with us in work."

Perhaps we cannot better declare the continued purposes of the Order than by again

quoting from your article. "Upon that solid rock (Christ Jesus) we of various denominational beliefs agreed to unite hand to hand, heart to heart, putting aside all differences of sectarian view in order that we might lead the thousands of women and girls enrolled under our banner to a larger Christian activity and deeper consecration to Him."

What the Order proposed to accomplish in the outset of its organization it still will aim to do. We deeply regret that a creed issue should have been made by our friends in the Council; but we believe it just to ourselves and to the Order at large to state that our Constitution remains unchanged, and that the Order exists to-day, a Christian Order, bound together to serve our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as we enrolled ourselves to do when the beautiful thought of united Christian service first crystallized into circles "The King's Daughters."

The Standing Committees will continue to work in our organization as heretofore, and, although other Christian women may preside over these committees, we believe that Christian work in home and foreign missions, in Churches and Sunday-schools, as well as in the philanthropic movements of the land, will continue to increase in power through the co-operation of the Order.

Hoping the readers of this statement will recognize the true status of the Order, and will understand that the existing Central Council has made no change in the teachings or requirements of its members, but has adhered to its original principle, Christ our personal King, we remain In His Name,

(Signed.)

MRS. MARGARET BOTTOME,

President;

MISS KATE BOND,

Vice-President;

MRS. MARY L. DICKINSON,

General Secretary;

MRS. ISABELLA CHARLES DAVIS,

Corresponding Secretary;

MRS. GRACE B. RUGGLES,

Recording Secretary;

MISS G. H. LIBBY,

Treasurer;

MISS MARGARET BARKER,

MRS. SETH LOW,

MRS. A. S. BARNES,

MRS. DAVID H. GREER.

The Central Council of the King's Daughters.

THE TRUE PROPORTION IN A CREED BETWEEN THE UNIVERSAL AND THE SPECIAL LOVE OF GOD.

BY W. G. T. SHEDD, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Presbyterian Journal*, Philadelphia, May 8, 1890.

It is objected that insufficient emphasis is laid in the Westminster Confession upon the universal offer of mercy, and the common call to faith and repentance, and some even contend that these are not contained in it. Advocates of Revision demand that these doctrines shall be more particularly enunciated than they now are, and complain that much more is said concerning the electing love of God in the effectual call, than upon His indiscriminate love in the outward call. In reply to this we mention the three following reasons why the Westminster Confession, in common with all the Reformed creeds, is more full and emphatic regarding the special love of God toward His Church than regarding His general love toward the world.

First, The Scriptures themselves are more full and emphatic in the first reference than in the last. A careful examination of the Old and New Testaments will show that while the universal compassion of God toward sinful men is plainly and frequently taught, yet it is the relation of God as the Saviour of His people that constitutes the larger proportion of the teachings of the Prophets, the Psalms, the Gospels, and the Epistles. These parts of Scripture are full of God's dealings with His covenant people, instructing them, expostulating with them, rebuking them, comforting them, helping them—expressing in these and other ways His special love and affection for them, as those whom He has chosen before the foundation of the world. Throughout the Bible, men universally are invited to believe and repent. No one disputes this. This is God's universal love. But whenever the love of God is particularly enlarged upon, carefully delineated, and repeatedly emphasized, in the great majority of instances it is His electing love. The Confession therefore follows the Scriptures in regard to the proportion of doctrine, when it puts the mercy of God toward His people in the foreground. And to object to this proportion is to object to divine revelation.

Second, The electing love of God and His special grace naturally has the foremost place in the Confession as in Scripture, because it is the only love and grace that is successful with the sinner. The universal

love of God in His outward call and common grace is a failure, because it is inadequate to overcome the enmity and resistance with which man meets it. While therefore the sacred writers represent the common call as prompted by the compassion of God toward the sinner, and expressive of His sincere desire that he would hear it, and as aggravating his persistence in the sin of which a free pardon is offered, yet inasmuch as it yields no saving and blessed results, they see no reason for making it the principal and prominent part of the Divine oracles. But that electing love in the effectual call and irresistible grace, which overcomes the aversion of the sinner and powerfully inclines his hostile will, inasmuch as it is the principal work of God in the human heart, becomes the principal subject of discourse for "the holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." They dwell rather on the special grace that triumphs over human depravity, than on the common grace that is defeated by it.

Third, The universal offer of mercy is not emphasized and enlarged upon in the Confession, because it is *superfluous*. That the offer of mercy in Christ is universal goes without saying; because if offered at all it *must* be offered universally. It is impossible to offer the atonement of Christ only to the elect. No man knows who are the elect, and therefore the ambassador of Christ must offer salvation to everybody or else to nobody. Any offer at all must, from the nature of the case, be unlimited. Why, therefore, waste words in a creed to declare what must be as a matter of course?

If it be objected that God knows who are the elect, and that it is inconsistent in *Him* to make a universal offer of mercy through an ignorant agent like a Christian minister, when He does not purpose to regenerate and save every individual man, this is a difficulty for Him, not for man. It is certainly consistent for man to offer mercy indiscriminately because he does not know who are the elect, even if it is not for God, because He does know. But *is* it inconsistent for God? What are the facts in relation to God? He offers mercy to a man in the outward call, and accompanies this call with that degree of grace denominated "common." The man despises the call and frustrates the grace, by suppressing conviction of sin and persisting in the worldly life which he loves. Now does the fact that God has decided not to do anything more than this toward the salvation of this resisting man prove that in doing *this* He has acted inconsistently with mercy? Is not

God's action up to this point kind, forbearing, patient and merciful? All that He has done to this man in the outward call and common grace has had no tendency to injure him by confirming him in sin, but, on the contrary, to benefit him by delivering him from it. There has been nothing hard or unmerciful in this form and grade of Divine grace toward this guilty sinner, who does not deserve the least degree of grace. It is true that it is not the highest form of grace, yet it is real grace, and far greater than any sinner merits. Is it inconsistent in God to do any kind and degree of good to a sinner, if He has decided not to do the highest kind and degree of good in His power? Shall God do nothing at all that is kind and gracious to a sinful man, unless He has decided to overcome all the opposition that he may make to His kindness and grace? Must God make no offer of mercy to a sinner, unless He has decided to make him accept it? Shall He extend the common call only in the case in which He intends to follow it with the effectual call?

There never was an age of the world when men more needed than now to be reminded that they are resisting the common grace of God, and rejecting His universal offer of mercy, and that in so doing they run the great hazard of God's *preterition*; of being passed by in the bestowment of regenerating grace. Men need to fear lest, by stifling conviction of sin and turning a deaf ear to the common call, they shall never be the subjects of the effectual call in regeneration.

CALVINISTS VS. CALVIN.

From *The New York Observer*, May 15, 1890.

ONE of the strangest phenomena of the times is the assault upon Calvin's theology from teachers in the Calvinistic Churches. Such attacks as are now common in Presbyterian weeklies and ecclesiastical assemblies have heretofore been characteristic of those who rejected the fundamental propositions of Calvin's theology. Now there are theologians who accept the fundamental fact of his theology—the absolute sovereignty of God—and then repudiate its legitimate and inevitable consequences. It is stranger still, that such persons misconceive and misstate Calvin's own explicit declarations of the doctrines, which he systematized with consummate skill and admirable logic. It is remarkable how Calvin fortified every proposition and definition. It seems as though he were endowed with prescience to forecast

and guard against the attacks of all coming time from all quarters. In the very hour when a great part of the world which had been hostile to his views had ceased the conflict, his positions are violently assailed by those who were ranked among his defenders.

To legitimate this internal warfare and justify a restatement of doctrine, a distinction is assumed between the Calvinism of Calvin and that of the present day—"the earlier and later Calvinism." It is asserted that Calvin's theology, especially on predestination and infant salvation, is unscriptural, harsh, abhorrent, and discouraging, that the world will not endure it and that the Church has outgrown it.

It is due to the truth and the honor of John Calvin to show that this distinction is unfair and not justified by anything he has written. If anything could be found in his works that would give occasion for certain representations of his view of reprobation, it would be in the chapter in his "Institutes" on that subject. But these are its closing sentences, "If you were to address any one thus: If you do not believe, the reason is because God has already doomed you to destruction, you would not only encourage sloth, but also give countenance to wickedness. Should any one give utterance to that sentiment in the future tense, and say that those who hear will not believe because they are reprobates, it were an imprecation rather than a doctrine. Wherefore Augustine not unreasonably orders such senseless preachers to retire from the Church. Because we know not who belongs to the number of the predestinated or does not belong, our desire ought to be that all may be saved." To such a statement the "latest" Calvinist or the most radical revisionist cannot object. Nay, more, they cannot possibly improve it.

John Calvin's Calvinism is charged with being akin to fatalism. He and his successors are said to have presented predestination so as to make God the cause of the perdition of those whom he deprived of the means of salvation. But this is Calvin's own definition, in which he clearly discriminates between fatalism and predestination: "The fate of the Stoics is a necessity which controls God himself. Predestination, as the Scriptures teach it, I define to be the free counsel of God by which he governs the human race and all parts of the world according to his immense wisdom and incorruptible justice." Correlated with this is his view of the love of God, which he expressed so beautifully in his last will and testament, "I also testify and declare that

as I am a suppliant, I ask of him that he would wash and purify me in the blood of my exalted Redeemer, shed for the sins of the human race."

Calvin's view of infant salvation is equally free from the imputations that are cast upon it. He was vastly in advance of the other reformers, excepting Zwingle and the Swiss. While the German and English reformers under Luther and Cranmer held on to the shreds of sacramentalism, he broke entirely away. He showed the true nature and relation of the sacraments in the economy of redemption. The others still regarded them as in some wise essential to salvation. They expressly stated that infants dying unbaptized were lost. Even John Wesley, nearly two centuries after Calvin, so believed and so stated in his work on redemption. The Roman Catholic Church to this day anathematizes all who deny this. Calvin's position was simply this: baptism is a sign and seal of redemption, and all who are subjects of redemption are entitled to it. Infants are the subjects of redemption; therefore it is not to be refused to them. There is not one word in any of his declarations on the subject which expresses his belief that any dying in infancy are lost; that they are called elect does not imply that any are non-elect—because he and all Calvinists hold that that is the term which distinguishes the whole body of the redeemed; infant and adult alike. Dr. Schaff in his Paper on the Consensus of the Reformed Church, in the First General Presbyterian Council held in Edinburgh, July 1877, said: "It is now become almost an article of faith in the Reformed Churches that all infants dying in infancy are saved by the atonement. This is a legitimate development of the Calvinistic doctrine of election, which allows of an indefinite extension of God's saving grace beyond the visible means of grace. All orthodox systems which hold to the necessity of water baptism for salvation, lead to the horrible conclusion that all unbaptized infants dying in infancy . . . are lost forever." Calvin said: "To exclude them from the grace of redemption would be too cruel." Of baptism he said: "If it is right that children should be brought to Christ, why should they not be admitted to baptism, the symbol of our communion and fellowship of Christ." Is it not strange that malediction should be heaped on the memory of the great man and almost the only teacher who wholly emancipated the world and the Church from the horrible doctrine of infant damnation which had been for ages made a doctrine and enforced with anathe-

mas by
tained
many
The
phasiz
"Tak
shafts
vinism

Pro
Prec
Fig

"I
giveth

A
thou
"M
slau
"R
perl
beat
He
She
us
tha
pel
ligh
No
"I
the
Sh

Sh
ea
th
m
flo
tu
hu
u
"I
sh

R
b
e
"I
a
t
f

mas by the Romish Church, and partly retained by the reformers of England and Germany?

The occurrences of the past winter emphasizes this caution of Bishop Horsley: "Take special care before you aim your shafts at Calvin, that you know what Calvinism is and what Calvinism is not."

FIVE-MINUTE SERMONS.

BY THE PAULIST FATHERS.

From *The Catholic Review*, New York, April 26, 1890.

Preached in their Church of St. Paul the Apostle, Fifty-ninth Street and Ninth Avenue, New York.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

"I am the Good Shepherd. The Good Shepherd giveth His life for His sheep."—*Gospel of the day.*

AMONG all the ways in which we have thought of our Blessed Lord of late—the "Man of Sorrows," the "Lamb led to the slaughter," the "Crucified for our sins," the "Risen and Glorified Saviour"—there is perhaps no way wherein He stands out more beautifully, or more lovingly, than when He says of Himself: "I am the Good Shepherd." What title is there that invites us more tenderly, or draws us more closely than this? Both the Epistle and the Gospel for to-day set Him before us in this light. He has suffered. He has risen. Now, He is our "Good Shepherd," the "Pastor and Bishop of our souls." And the proof of His title is this: "The Good Shepherd giveth His life for His sheep."

My brethren, our Lord is the same Good Shepherd now as He was during His life on earth. He speaks as truly now as He spoke then: "I am the Good Shepherd." He is more truly, more closely present with His flock than when He suffered His divine nature to be veiled in the feeble frame of a human form. He is with us always—"even unto the consummation of the world." For "we are the people of His pasture, and the sheep of His hand."

How is He now our Good Shepherd? First, He *leads* His sheep. He leads them by His Holy Spirit. He leads them by His example. As the Epistle of to-day tells us: "Christ also suffered for us, leaving you an example that you should follow His steps." His indwelling Spirit guides us in the path of life; filling our souls with love for Him, and desire to be like Him and to be with Him, giving us both the will and the power to come to Him. "My sheep

hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me, and I give them life everlasting." We hear His voice saying, "Come unto Me, all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you. Take up My yoke upon you, and learn of Me, because I am meek and humble of heart, and you shall find rest to your souls."

And again, as He *leads* His sheep, so He also *feeds* them. "He hath set me in a place of pasture," says the Psalmist, "He hath brought me up on the water of refreshment." Oh, my brethren, how much better it would be for us if we hungered and thirsted more for that heavenly food and for those living waters! For then, according to the promise of the Beatitudes, "we should be filled." Has He not said: "I am the living Bread, which came down from Heaven. If any man eat of this Bread he shall live forever; and the Bread which I will give is My Flesh for the life of the world." That is the true food wherewith the Good Shepherd feeds His flock; and at this Paschal season we have every reason to be mindful of our need of it, and of our obligation to receive it. And while we speak of our Divine Shepherd thus caring for His sheep, those tender words of the Prophet Isaias rise to our memory—words full of sweetness, as though sung by choirs of angels: "He shall feed His flock like a shepherd; He shall gather together the lambs with His arm, and shall take them up in His bosom; and He Himself shall carry them that are with young."

And once more, as the Gospel tells us, the Good Shepherd will seek out and help even the wandering sheep and bring them back to His fold.

Are we among the number of those wandering sheep, my brethren? Have we strayed afar from the flock, caught perhaps in the thorns and brambles of some besetting sin? He will seek us, no matter how far we have wandered; He *has* sought us over and over again; He is seeking us now. Oh, despise not His gracious promises; oh, reject not His proffered love! Alas, for our blindness, which will not see His guiding hand, and for our deafness, which will not hear His warning voice! Let us follow Him, my brethren—our Divine Example, our Good Shepherd—through ever greener pastures, by ever purer streams. Let us never be content until we, with all the flock, at last arrive at that blessed Fold where "they shall not hunger, nor thirst any more; neither shall the sun fall on them, nor any heat: for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall rule them, and

shall lead them to the fountains of the waters of life; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST ITSELF.

From *The Christian Advocate*, (M. E.) New York, May 8, 1890.

Forty years ago the Supreme Court of the United States decided "That a general statute of a State prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors without license from municipal authorities, including liquors brought from another State, and sold by the importer in the original barrel or package," was *not* in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

On the 28th day of last month the Supreme Court decided that without a special Act of Congress a State in which Prohibition has been enacted cannot prevent the sale and delivery of liquor to citizens of the said State by citizens of any other State. The case on which this decision is rendered is this: A firm of beer brewers in Peoria, Ill., shipped beer in sealed kegs and cases to Keokuk, Ia., where their agent, a non-resident, put it on sale in the original packages. The marshal of Keokuk seized it, and the brewers brought suit on the ground that the seizure was unconstitutional because the Constitution gives Congress the sole power to regulate commerce between the States. The local Court decided in favor of the brewers, but the marshal appealed to the Supreme Court of Iowa, which reversed the decision. Then the brewers appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, which reverses the decision of the Supreme Court of Iowa. Three of the members of the Supreme Court—GRAY, HARLAN, and BREWER—dissent. GRAY, long Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, writes the dissenting opinion. In it he shows that the decision made forty years ago, now practically reversed, was made upon full argument and great consideration; that it concurs with the practice during the hundred years since the adoption of the Constitution, and that it has been accepted and acted upon by Congress, State Legislatures, Courts, and people ever since.

Unquestionably decisions of high Courts are influenced as much by the conscious or sub-conscious sympathies of members as by abstract principles. Not that in some cases the principles do not prevail; but in many

others the sympathies must. Take, for example, the Electoral Commission of 1876. It was eight to seven, the Justices of the Supreme Court deciding upon strictly party lines. As an able writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May shows:

Most of its members no doubt approached the question with a patriotic purpose to be perfectly impartial, perfectly judicial. They listened to arguments on both sides, and deliberated and gave their opinions; and they were divided eight to seven—precisely on party lines; and this not merely on one or two of the questions, but on every question of importance. In thirty-four divisions of eight to seven; almost every one that is recorded.

It is quite easy to conceive a state of things in which the Supreme Court of the United States would decide this very question the other way by an equal majority or greater; but until it is reversed it is the law of the land.

WHAT WILL BE ITS EFFECT?

It means that the people of the States surrounding Iowa, Kansas, or Maine, or the people of any State, may sell liquor to the inhabitants of Maine, Iowa, or Kansas in any amount, from a flask to a vessel as large as the most capacious oil-tank ever carried by a train. Nor can any law be made to embarrass the delivery to the purchaser in any part of those Prohibition States.

Not only so, but if we understand it aright, the Supreme Court expressly decides that any person or firm has a right to have an agent in the State, and that he may sell the liquor in the original packages in which it was brought into the State. This is the passage:

The plaintiffs in error are citizens of Illinois, and have no permits, but import into Iowa beer which they sell in original packages, as described in our decision in *Bowman vs. Chicago*, re *Bidway Co.*, *supra*. They had the right to import this beer into that State, and in the view which we have expressed they had the right to sell it, by which act alone it would be commingled in the common mass of property within the State. Up to that point, then, we hold that, in the absence of Congressional permission to do so, the State had no power to interfere by seizure, or in any other action, in prohibition of importation and sale by the foreign or non-resident importer.

If, in view of the nature of the suit, and the act performed against which the appeal was taken, any one can show that we misunderstand the scope of the decision as respects the power of a non-resident manufacturer of liquor to have a non-resident agent in a State to sell the liquor to all comers in the original flasks or vessels, we should be glad to have it done.

Under this decision, first, any citizen of

any State may buy elsewhere and take into the State all liquors that he wishes for his own use. This had been previously settled, and is nothing new. Second, all manufacturers and venders of liquor elsewhere may establish agencies in the States and sell to the inhabitants thereof for their own use any liquors in the original packages in which they sent them into the State. The only way in which a Prohibition State can hope to prevent this is by procuring a special Act of Congress. Therefore the people of such States must apply to Congress for relief. As respects this matter, they are in exactly the same condition they would be if this were exclusively a Federal Government, and there were no such restrictions as State rights.

WHAT RESORT HAVE PROHIBITION STATES?

Meanwhile what can the States do which find their laws trampled under foot and their will set aside? They must make every conceivable regulation, and enforce them by every means which police power given to the States allows to prevent the *second* sale or gift, in whole or in part, of the liquor. This is constitutional. Whoever buys a flask of liquor imported from another State may drink it, but the State may pass laws forbidding him either to sell or give away one drop of it. Hence, the *saloon* may still be destroyed and the rum-selling druggist subjected to all the existing limitations; for the *citizen* of Iowa or any other Prohibition State cannot sell a drop therein, nor could any outside liquor manufacturing or selling firm employ a citizen of the State as an agent therein. In every case he must be a non-resident, and in every case after he has sold the original package to a citizen of the State, it is subject to every law of seizure and destruction and to every penalty the moment it is offered by a citizen for sale, or by any one, citizen or not, *after the breaking of the package*.

The decision will, as Justice GRAY says, "cripple, if not destroy, the whole control of every State over the sale of intoxicating liquors within its borders," unless the most stringent measures are adopted and enforced to restrict the effect to possible legal consequences of this decision. Then, of course, the cry against spies and trying to interfere with the rights of the people will be raised.

It is probable that some of the difficulties and decisions concerning other matters have prepared the minds of the majority of the Court for this decision. Some years ago certain of the States, under cover of attempting to protect the health of the peo-

ple, enacted laws excluding from their own borders cattle slaughtered in the West; and these laws were overthrown on the same ground. And the principle laid down by the Supreme Court will affect various kinds of business. For example, if it should be known that a contagious and destructive disease prevailed among horses or cattle in the State of New Jersey, the State of New York, by any authority which it possesses for self-protection, could not prevent residents of that State from bringing them across the line. It must have a special Act of Congress. In some such cases, we think, acts have been passed. Oleomargarine is prohibited in some of the States; but by this decision, if it is sent into them in original packages, and offered for sale by non-resident agents of outside firms, it cannot be stopped. Who knows but the Louisiana Lottery Company will appeal soon against the prohibition of the sale of its tickets in the "original packages!" Nevertheless, while noting the fallibility of its members, and emphasizing the flat contradiction between its decision and that upon which the country has acted for forty years, we will not be guilty of disrespect to so august a body.

The almost uncontrollable joy of the liquor-dealers over this decision is a full answer to the frivolous remarks of such of their unavowed friends as say that it will probably not increase the sale of liquor.

THE PARSONAGE BORE.

BY REV. GEORGE S. BUTTERS.

From *Zion's Herald*, (M. E.) Boston, May 7, 1890.

THIS character is one of the great trials of the minister's household. The bore I mean can be found in nearly every community. His piety is usually his strong point, but he is just as troublesome for all that. He belongs to a class of people who look upon the church parsonage as a place whose doors are open night and day, and whose occupants have nothing to do but to entertain any well-disposed members of the church or community who may chance to ring the bell. These people make it their boast that they have always been an adviser to the minister. If they are women, they will tell you that the minister's wife always made a confidant of them, and that they often went to the parsonage to comfort her in her trials, and that if they were inclined they could tell you things which would

make your heart ache. The bore always comes at the wrong time, and has not sense enough to know it. He also stays so long that one of his visits is sufficient for a five-years' pastorate according to the parsonage estimate. He apologizes if he does not call once a week at least. In some cases he goes oftener than that. He thinks his minister is working too hard, and calls some evening after meeting and stays until nearly midnight. Or she has heard the minister's wife is not well, and she calls at two in the afternoon and stays until tea-time, and goes away to tell the people that their minister will soon be a widower. Sometimes they weary you by their talkativeness, and just as often by stupid and inquisitive silence. There are ministers' wives who went to heaven long before the Lord intended they should, simply because they lost health and patience and hope in affording entertainment for these tiresome people. Many times the good women hoped it might prove that they had entertained "angels unaware." They did prove so, but angels of death.

The bore may be rich or poor, ignorant or wise, sensible or cranky. He is a bore just the same. The social ministerial family are in demand in our churches, but their very power may become a weakness. The parsonage is the minister's home. It should be a centre of religious social life; not by centring all social entertainment there, not by weakening other homes to make it strong, but by making its influence felt in every home in that parish, and by making people feel that their own home is the true source of the best and highest social life. A minister is loved who wins the hearts of the people to himself, but it is no compliment to him that his people refuse to be comforted after his departure, no matter how sympathetic and helpful and able his successor may be. He is a more successful preacher and a stronger type of manhood who has won the love of his people to the church and to their duty, and in doing that made them entirely independent of him. He may not have been popular with the parsonage bore, but his industry has pleased the Lord and shown its fruits in his study and pulpit work. His wife may not have been considered as social as former mistresses of the manse; but she is respected more by sensible and refined people who realize that she has been true to her family responsibility, and has not allowed any invasion of her household rights.

I know that in many parsonages this question is not as easy of settlement as

would seem on paper. I also know that in some communities the bore is more common than in others. The minister's family who have help can more easily rid themselves of the troublesome visitor than those who go to the door themselves. One fact must be settled: It may take heroic treatment, but *the bore must go*, if the parsonage is to become a place of blessing to its inmates as well as to others. Make them feel that your time is precious. Inspire them with your own industry. Have an understanding when you go to a new charge that it is one of your principles to *make and receive short calls*. Some good people will be offended? Yes, but better so than the cause of God should suffer.

PARAGRAPHIC.

THE VATICAN COPYISTS.—Autotype machines have just been served out for the first time to some of the copying clerks at the Vatican; but (according to the Continental correspondent of the *Glasgow Herald*) they are only to be used for the roughest kind of proof-work which has to be done in a hurry. The Pope dislikes the innovation, for he is anxious—and rightly so—not to break up the admirable school of penmanship which flourishes at the Vatican. There is no such writing in the world as that which is seen on the documents sent out by the Curia. All the copying clerks of the first rank are priests and monks, and many of them real artists in calligraphy. They are allowed to exercise their fancy in the tracing of illuminated capitals and ornamental rubrics or margins; but there must not be a single erasure on a page which has been issued in the Pope's name. A misplaced comma causes a whole page to be rewritten.—*The Catholic Review*.

REV. W. HARPER has lately written a paper on the hindrances to missionary work in India. Among other things he says: "Time permits me to mention only one other hindrance. It is the evil done by what our American friends would call tall writing and tall speaking about our work. The missionary who, as things go, asserts that India will presently be Christianized is either vehemently piping to the popular ear or he is singularly defective in sound judgment. The great evil of this is that, among the home churches, it raises false hopes, nourishes impatience for results, and stimulates that tremendous moral pressure for results which many missionaries cannot altogether resist. It feeds the fever for statistics; it formulates estimates for so many and so many conversions within a given time; and from first to last it is the mother of endless humbug. It discourages the humble, earnest, true worker; it encourages the multiplication of mock missionaries, with their mock results, and it fills the churches less or more with wolves in sheep's clothing. My belief is that the best missionary work in India is but little heard of and but little thought of, while the Lord is laying the foundations of Zion in India. 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' The missionary dreamer, or fiction weaver, though popular, is a great hindrance in the way of hastening slowly, and in the way of humble, patient waiting on God—the secret of true success."—*Central Presbyterian, Richmond*.

centur
year 8
and w
to the
he was
the w
once t
Bavon
was a
reason
origin
other
tures
"His
the fo
all ma
closely

Wh
affairs
one do
the c
Louis
This
lies b
nowa
in an
to my
permi
the p
style
or ma
time
about
deaco
arriv
favor
inter
havin
turn
to a
and
was
bless
the
num
turn
I be
to o
rest
that
obs
abo
swe
V
terv
pap
alo
—
Bad
+
bro
dus

VIII.

THE VALUE OF WITNESS TO THE
MIRACULOUS.

BY PROFESSOR THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

(Continued from the May number, p. 119.)

century, somewhere, apparently, about the year 830, when Eginhard, ailing in health and weary of political life, had withdrawn to the monastery of Seligenstadt, of which he was the founder. A manuscript copy of the work, made in the tenth century, and once the property of the monastery of St. Bavon on the Scheldt, of which Eginhard was abbot, is still extant, and there is no reason to believe that, in this copy, the original has been in any way interpolated or otherwise tampered with. The main features of the strange story contained in the "*Historia Translationis*" are set forth in the following pages, in which, in regard to all matters of importance, I shall adhere as closely as possible to Eginhard's own words :

While I was still at court, busied with secular affairs, I often thought of the leisure which I hoped one day to enjoy in a solitary place, far away from the crowd, with which the liberality of Prince Louis, whom I then served, had provided me. This place is situated in that part of Germany which lies between the Neckar and the Main,* and is nowadays called the Odenwald by those who live in and about it. And here having built, according to my capacity and resources, not only houses and permanent dwellings, but also a basilica fitted for the performance of divine service and of no mean style of construction, I began to think to what saint or martyr I could best dedicate it. A good deal of time had passed while my thoughts fluctuated about this matter, when it happened that a certain deacon of the Roman Church, named Deusdona, arrived at the court for the purpose of seeking the favor of the king in some affairs in which he was interested. He remained some time; and then having transacted his business, he was about to return to Rome, when one day, moved by courtesy to a stranger, we invited him to a modest refectory; and while talking of many things at table, mention was made of the translation of the body of the blessed Sebastian,† and of the neglected tombs of the martyrs, of which there is such a prodigious number at Rome; and the conversation having turned toward the dedication of our new basilica, I began to inquire how it might be possible for me to obtain some of the true relics of the saints which rest at Rome. He at first hesitated, and declared that he did not know how that could be done. But observing that I was both anxious and curious about the subject, he promised to give me an answer some other day.

When I returned to the question, some time afterward, he immediately drew from his bosom a paper, which he begged me to read when I was alone, and to tell him what I was disposed to think

of that which was therein stated. I took the paper, and, as he desired, read it alone and in secret. (Cap. i, 2, 3.)

I shall have occasion to return to Deacon Deusdona's conditions, and to what happened after Eginhard's acceptance of them. Suffice it, for the present, to say that Eginhard's notary, Ratleicus (Ratleig), was dispatched to Rome and succeeded in securing two bodies, supposed to be those of the holy martyrs Marcellinus and Petrus; and when he had got as far on his homeward journey as the Burgundian town of Solothurn or Soleure,* notary Ratleig dispatched to his master, at St. Bavon, a letter announcing the success of his mission.

As soon as by reading it I was assured of the arrival of the saints, I dispatched a confidential messenger to Maestricht, to gather together priests, other clerics, and also laymen, to go out to meet the coming saints as speedily as possible. And he and his companions, having lost no time, after a few days met those who had charge of the saints at Solothurn. Joined with them, and with a vast crowd of people who gathered from all parts, singing hymns, and amid great and universal rejoicings, they traveled quickly to the city of Argentoraturn, which is now called Strasburg. Thence embarking on the Rhine they came to the place called Portus,† and landing on the east bank of the river, at the fifth station, thence they arrived at Michilinstadt,‡ accompanied by an immense multitude, praising God. This place is in that forest of Germany which in modern times is called the Odenwald, and about six leagues from the Main. And here, having found a basilica recently built by me, but not yet consecrated, they carried the sacred remains into it and deposited them therein, as if it were to be their final resting-place. As soon as all this was reported to me, I traveled thither as quickly as I could. (Cap. ii, 14.)

Three days after Eginhard's arrival began the series of wonderful events which he narrates, and for which we have his personal guarantee. The first thing that he notices is the dream of a servant of Ratleig the notary, who, being set to watch the holy relics in the church after vespers, went to sleep, and during his slumbers had a vision of two pigeons, one white and one gray and white, which came and sat upon the bier over the relics; while, at the same time, a voice ordered the man to tell his master that the holy martyrs had chosen another resting-place and desired to be transported thither without delay.

Unfortunately, the saints seem to have forgotten to mention where they wished to go, and, with the most anxious desire to gratify their smallest wishes, Eginhard was naturally greatly perplexed what to do.

* At present included in the duchies of Hesse-Darmstadt and Baden.

† This took place in the year 826 A.D. The relics were brought from Rome and deposited in the Church of St. Medardus at Soissons.

* Now included in western Switzerland.

† Probably, according to Teulet, the present Sandhofer-fahrt, a little below the embouchure of the Neckar.

‡ The present Michilstadt, thirty miles northeast of Heidelberg.

While in this state of mind, he was one day contemplating his "great and wonderful treasure, more precious than all the gold in the world," when it struck him that the chest in which the relics were contained was quite unworthy of its contents; and after vespers he gave orders to one of the sacristans to take the measure of the chest in order that a more fitting shrine might be constructed. The man, having lighted a wax candle and raised the pall which covered the relics, in order to carry out his master's orders, was astonished and terrified to observe that the chest was covered with a blood-like exudation (*loculum mirum in modum humore sanguineo undique distillantem*), and at once sent a message to Eginhard.

Then I and those priests who accompanied me beheld this stupendous miracle, worthy of all admiration. For just as when it is going to rain, pillars and slabs and marble images exude moisture, and, as it were, sweat, so the chest which contained the most sacred relics was found moist with the blood exuding on all sides. (Cap. ii, 16.)

Three days' fast was ordained in order that the meaning of the portent might be ascertained. All that happened, however, was that at the end of that time the "blood," which had been exuding in drops all the while, dried up. Eginhard is careful to say that the liquid "had a saline taste, something like that of tears, and was thin as water, though of the color of true blood," and he clearly thinks this satisfactory evidence that it was blood.

The same night another servant had a vision, in which still more imperative orders for the removal of the relics were given; and, from that time forth, "not a single night passed without one, two, or even three of our companions receiving revelations in dreams that the bodies of the saints were to be transferred from that place to another." At last a priest, Hildfrid, saw, in a dream, a venerable white-haired man in a priest's vestments, who bitterly reproached Eginhard for not obeying the repeated orders of the saints, and upon this the journey was commenced. Why Eginhard delayed obedience to these repeated visions so long does not appear. He does not say so in so many words, but the general tenor of the narrative leads one to suppose that Mulinheim (afterward Seligenstadt) is the "solitary place" in which he had built the church which awaited dedication. In that case all the people about him would know that he desired that the saints should go there. If a glimmering of secular sense led him to be a little suspicious about the real cause of the unanimity of the visionary beings who mani-

festated themselves to his *entourage* in favor of moving on, he does not say so.

At the end of the first day's journey the precious relics were deposited in the church of St. Martin, in the village of Ostheim. Hither a paralytic nun (*sanctimonialis quædam paralytica*) of the name of Ruodlang was brought in a car by her friends and relatives from a monastery a league off. She spent the night watching and praying by the bier of the saints; "and health returning to all her members, on the morrow she went back to her place whence she came, on her feet, nobody supporting her, or in any way giving her assistance." (Cap. ii, 19.)

On the second day the relics were carried to Upper Mulinheim, and finally, in accordance with the orders of the martyrs, deposited in the church of that place, which was therefore renamed Seligenstadt. Here, Daniel, a beggar boy of fifteen, and so bent that "he could not look at the sky without lying on his back," collapsed and fell down during the celebration of the mass. "Thus he lay a long time, as if asleep, and all his limbs straightening and his flesh strengthening (*recepta firmitate nervorum*), he arose before our eyes, quite well." (Cap. ii, 20.)

Some time afterward an old man entered the church on his hands and knees, being unable to use his limbs properly:

He, in the presence of all of us, by the power of God and the merits of the blessed martyrs, in the same hour in which he entered was so perfectly cured that he walked without so much as a stick. And he said that, though he had been deaf for five years, his deafness had ceased along with the palsy. (Cap. iii, 33.)

Eginhard was now obliged to return to the court at Aix-la-Chapelle, where his duties kept him through the winter; and he is careful to point out that the later miracles which he proceeds to speak of are known to him only at second hand. But, as he naturally observes, having seen such wonderful events with his own eyes, why should he doubt similar narrations when they are received from trustworthy sources?

Wonderful stories these are indeed, but as they are, for the most part, of the same general character as those already recounted, they may be passed over. There is, however, an account of a possessed maiden which is worth attention.

This is set forth in a memoir, the principal contents of which are the speeches of a demon who declared that he possessed the singular appellation of "Wiggo," and revealed himself in the presence of many witnesses, before the altar, close to the relics of the blessed martyrs. It is noteworthy that the revelations appear to have been made in

the shape of replies to the questions of the exorcising priest, and there is no means of judging how far the answers are really only the questions to which the patient replied yes or no.

The possessed girl, about sixteen years of age, was brought by her parents to the basilica of the martyrs.

When she approached the tomb containing the sacred bodies, the priest, according to custom, read the formula of exorcism over her head. When he began to ask how and when the demon had entered her, she answered, not in the tongue of the barbarians, which alone the girl knew, but in the Roman tongue. And when the priest was astonished and asked how she came to know Latin, when her parents, who stood by, were wholly ignorant of it, "Thou hast never seen my parents," was the reply. To this the priest, "Whence art thou, then, if these are not thy parents?" And the demon, by the mouth of the girl, "I am a follower and disciple of Satan, and for a long time I was gatekeeper (janitor) in hell; but, for some years, along with eleven companions, I have ravaged the kingdom of the Franks." (Cap. v, 49.)

He then goes on to tell how they blasted the crops and scattered pestilence among beasts and men, because of the prevalent wickedness of the people.*

The enumeration of all these iniquities, in oratorical style, takes up a whole octavo page; and at the end it is stated, "All these things the demon spoke in Latin by the mouth of the girl."

And when the priest imperatively ordered him to come out, "I shall go," said he, "not in obedience to you, but on account of the power of the saints, who do not allow me to remain any longer." And, having said this, he threw the girl down on the floor and there compelled her to lie prostrate for a time, as though she slumbered. After a little while, however, he going away, the girl, by the power of Christ and the merits of the blessed martyrs, as it were awakening from sleep, rose up quite well, to the astonishment of all present; nor after the demon had gone out was she able to speak Latin: so that it was plain enough that it was not she who had spoken in that tongue, but the demon by her mouth. (Cap. v, 51.)

If the "Historia Translationis" contained nothing more than has been, at present, laid before the reader, disbelief in the miracles of which it gives so precise and full a record might well be regarded as hyper-skepticism. It might fairly be said: "Here you have a man, whose high character, acute intelligence, and large instruction are certified by eminent contemporaries; a man who stood high in the confidence of one of the greatest rulers of any age, and whose other works prove him to be an accurate and judicious narrator of ordinary events. This man tells you, in language which bears the stamp of

sincerity, of things which happened within his own knowledge, or within that of persons in whose veracity he has entire confidence, while he appeals to his sovereign and the court as witnesses of others; what possible ground can there be for disbelieving him?"

Well, it is hard upon Eginhard to say so, but it is exactly the honesty and sincerity of the man which are his undoing as a witness to the miraculous. He himself makes it quite obvious that when his profound piety comes on the stage, his good sense and even his perception of right and wrong make their exit. Let us go back to the point at which we left him, secretly perusing the letter of Deacon Deusdona. As he tells us, its contents were—

that he (the deacon) had many relics of saints at home, and that he would give them to me if I would furnish him with the means of returning to Rome; he had observed that I had two mules, and, if I would let him have one of them and would dispatch with him a confidential servant to take charge of the relics, he would at once send them to me. This plausibly expressed proposition pleased me, and I made up my mind to test the value of the somewhat ambiguous promise at once; so giving him the mule and money for his journey I ordered my notary Ratleig (who already desired to go to Rome to offer his devotions there) to go with him. Therefore, having left Aix-la-Chapelle (where the emperor and his court resided at the time) they came to Soissons. Here they spoke with Hildoin, abbot of the monastery of St. Medardus, because the said deacon had assured him that he had the means of placing in his possession the body of the blessed Tiburtius the martyr. Attracted by which promises he (Hildoin) sent with them a certain priest, Hunus by name, a sharp man (*hominem callidum*), whom he ordered to receive and bring back the body of the martyr in question. And so, resuming their journey, they proceeded to Rome as fast as they could. (Cap. i, 3.)

Unfortunately, a servant of the notary, one Reginbald, fell ill of a tertian fever, and impeded the progress of the party. However, this piece of adversity had its sweet uses; for, three days before they reached Rome, Reginbald had a vision. Somebody habited as a deacon appeared to him and asked why his master was in such a hurry to get to Rome; and when Reginbald explained their business, this visionary deacon, who seems to have taken the measure of his brother in the flesh with some accuracy, told him not by any means to expect that Deusdona would fulfill his promises. Moreover, taking the servant by the hand, he led him to the top of a high mountain, and, showing him Rome (where the man had

* It is pretty clear that Eginhard had his doubts about the deacon, whose pledge he qualifies as *sponsiones incertæ*. But, to be sure, he wrote after events which fully justified skepticism.

* In the middle ages one of the most favorite accusations against witches was that they committed just these enormities.

never been), pointed out a church, adding: "Tell Ratleig the thing he wants is hidden there; let him get it as quickly as he can and go back to his master"; and, by way of a sign that the order was authoritative, the servant was promised that from that time forth his fever should disappear. And as the fever did vanish to return no more, the faith of Eginhard's people in Deacon Deusdona naturally vanished with it (*et fidem diaconi promissis non haberent*). Nevertheless, they put up at the deacon's house near St. Peter da Vincula. But time went on and no relics made their appearance, while the notary and the priest were put off with all sorts of excuses—the brother to whom the relics had been confided was gone to Beneventum and not expected back for some time, and so on—until Ratleig and Hunus began to despair, and were minded to return, *infecto negotio*.

But my notary, calling to mind his servant's dream, proposed to his companion that they should go to the cemetery which their host had talked about without him. So, having found and hired a guide, they went in the first place to the basilica of the blessed Tiburtius in the Via Labicana, about three thousand paces from the town, and cautiously and carefully inspected the tomb of that martyr, in order to discover whether it could be opened without any one being the wiser. Then they descended into the adjoining crypt, in which the bodies of the blessed martyrs of Christ, Marcellinus and Petrus, were buried; and, having made out the nature of their tomb, they went away thinking their host would not know what they had been about. But things fell out differently from what they had imagined. (Cap. i, 7.)

In fact Deacon Deusdona, who doubtless kept an eye on his guests, knew all about their manoeuvres and made haste to offer his services, in order that, "with the help of God" (*si Deus votis eorum favere dignaretur*), they should all work together. The deacon was evidently alarmed lest they should succeed without his help.

So, by way of preparation for the contemplated *vol avec effraction*, they fasted three days; and then, at night, without being seen, they betook themselves to the basilica of St. Tiburtius, and tried to break open the altar erected over his remains. But the marble proving too solid, they descended to the crypt, and "having invoked our Lord Jesus Christ and adored the holy martyrs," they proceeded to prise off the stone which covered the tomb, and thereby exposed the body of the most sacred martyr Marcellinus, "whose head rested on a marble tablet on which his name was inscribed." The body was taken up with the greatest veneration, wrapped in a rich covering, and given over to the keeping of the deacon and his brother

Lunison, while the stone was replaced with such care that no sign of the theft remained.

As sacrilegious proceedings of this kind were punishable with death by the Roman law, it seems not unnatural that Deacon Deusdona should have become uneasy, and have urged Ratleig to be satisfied with what he had got and be off with his spoils. But the notary having thus cleverly captured the blessed Marcellinus, thought it a pity he should be parted from the blessed Petrus, side by side with whom he had rested for five hundred years and more in the same sepulchre (as Eginhard pathetically observes); and the pious man could neither eat, drink, nor sleep, until he had compassed his desire to reunite the saintly colleagues. This time, apparently in consequence of Deusdona's opposition to any further resurrectionist doings, he took counsel with a Greek monk, one Basil, and, accompanied by Hunus, but saying nothing to Deusdona, they committed another sacrilegious burglary, securing this time, not only the body of the blessed Petrus, but a quantity of dust, which they agreed the priest should take, and tell his employer that it was the remains of the blessed Tiburtius.

How Deusdona was "squared," and what he got for his not very valuable complicity in these transactions, does not appear. But at last the relics were sent off in charge of Lunison, the brother of Deusdona, and the priest Hunus, as far as Pavia, while Ratleig stopped behind for a week to see if the robbery was discovered, and, presumably, to act as a blind if any hue and cry were raised. But, as everything remained quiet, the notary betook himself to Pavia, where he found Lunison and Hunus awaiting his arrival. The notary's opinion of the character of his worthy colleagues, however, may be gathered from the fact that, having persuaded them to set out in advance along a road which he told them he was about to take, he immediately adopted another route, and, traveling by way of St. Maurice and the Lake of Geneva, eventually reached Soleure.

Eginhard tells all this story with the most naïve air of unconsciousness that there is anything remarkable about an abbot, and a high officer of state to boot, being an accessory both before and after the fact to a most gross and scandalous act of sacrilegious and burglarious robbery. And an amusing sequel to the story proves that, where relics were concerned, his friend Hildoin, another high ecclesiastical dignitary, was even less scrupulous than himself.

Or
after
Selig
an a
and
of t
conv
to th
the
Hild
that
Muc
son
relic
that
bett
the
from
Hu
for
his
The
nun
Hu
ove
wa
to
wh
up

it v
son
sel
mi
off
ha
ch
of
op
ou
ex
bu
th
no
(C

E
p
b
h
u

v
a
r

On going to the palace early one morning, after the saints were safely bestowed at Seligenstadt, he found Hildoin waiting for an audience in the emperor's ante-chamber, and began to talk to him about the miracle of the bloody exudation. In the course of conversation, Eginhard happened to allude to the remarkable fineness of the garment of the blessed Marcellinus. Whereupon Abbot Hildoin replied (to Eginhard's stupefaction) that his observation was quite correct. Much astonished at this remark from a person who was supposed not to have seen the relics, Eginhard asked him how he knew that. Upon this, Hildoin saw that he had better make a clean breast of it, and he told the following story, which he had received from his priestly agent, Hunus: While Hunus and Lunison were at Pavia, waiting for Eginhard's notary, Hunus (according to his own account) had robbed the robbers. The relics were placed in a church, and a number of laymen and clerics, of whom Hunus was one, undertook to keep watch over them. One night, however, all the watchers, save the wide-awake Hunus, went to sleep; and then, according to the story which this "sharp" ecclesiastic foisted upon his patron—

it was borne in upon his mind that there must be some great reason why all the people, except himself, had suddenly become somnolent; and, determining to avail himself of the opportunity thus offered (*oblata occasione utendum*), he rose and, having lighted a candle, silently approached the chests. Then, having burned through the threads of the seals with the flame of the candle, he quickly opened the chests, which had no locks;* and, taking out portions of each of the bodies which were thus exposed, he closed the chests and connected the burned ends of the threads with the seals again, so that they appeared not to have been touched; and, no one having seen him, he returned to his place. (Cap. iii, 23.)

Hildoin went on to tell Eginhard that Hunus at first declared to him that these purloined relics belonged to St. Tiburtius; but afterward confessed, as a great secret, how he had come by them, and he wound up his discourse thus:

They have a place of honor beside St. Medardus, where they are worshiped with great veneration by all the people; but whether we may keep them or not is for your judgment. (Cap. iii, 23.)

Poor Eginhard was thrown into a state of great perturbation of mind by this revelation. An acquaintance of his had recently told him of a rumor that was spread about, that Hunus had contrived to abstract *all* the

remains of SS. Marcellinus and Petrus while Eginhard's agents were in a drunken sleep; and that, while the real relics were in Abbot Hildoin's hands at St. Medardus, the shrine at Seligenstadt contained nothing but a little dust. Though greatly annoyed by this "execrable rumor, spread everywhere by the subtlety of the devil," Eginhard had doubtless comforted himself by his supposed knowledge of its falsity, and he only now discovered how considerable a foundation there was for the scandal. There was nothing for it but to insist upon the return of the stolen treasures. One would have thought that the holy man, who had admitted himself to be knowingly a receiver of stolen goods, would have made instant restitution and begged only for absolution. But Eginhard intimates that he had very great difficulty in getting his brother abbot to see that even restitution was necessary.

Hildoin's proceedings were not of such nature as to lead any one to place implicit trust in anything he might say; still less had his agent, priest Hunus, established much claim to confidence; and it is not surprising that Eginhard should have lost no time in summoning his notary and Lunison to his presence, in order that he might hear what they had to say about the business. They, however, at once protested that priest Hunus's story was a parcel of lies, and that after the relics left Rome no one had any opportunity of meddling with them. Moreover, Lunison, throwing himself at Eginhard's feet, confessed with many tears what actually took place. It will be remembered that, after the body of St. Marcellinus was abstracted from its tomb, Ratleig deposited it in the house of Deusdona, in charge of the latter's brother, Lunison. But Hunus, being very much disappointed that he could not get hold of the body of St. Tiburtius, and afraid to go back to his abbot empty-handed, bribed Lunison with four pieces of gold and five of silver to give him access to the chest. This Lunison did, and Hunus helped himself to as much as would fill a gallon measure (*vas sextarii mensuram*) of the sacred remains. Eginhard's indignation at the "rapine" of this "nequissimus nebulo" is exquisitely droll. It would appear that the adage about the receiver being as bad as the thief was not current in the ninth century.

Let us now briefly sum up the history of the acquisition of the relics. Eginhard makes a contract with Deusdona for the delivery of certain relics which the latter says he possesses. Eginhard makes no inquiry

* The words are *scrinia sine clavis*, which seem to mean "having no key." But the circumstances forbid the idea of breaking open.

how he came by them ; otherwise, the transaction is innocent enough.

Deusdona turns out to be a swindler, and has no relics. Thereupon Eginhard's agent, after due fasting and prayer, breaks open the tombs and helps himself.

Eginhard discovers, by the self-betrayal of his brother abbot, Hildoin, that portions of his relics have been stolen and conveyed to the latter. With much ado he succeeds in getting them back.

Hildoin's agent, Hunus, in delivering these stolen goods to him, at first declared they were the relics of St. Tiburtius, which Hildoin desired him to obtain ; but afterward invented a story of their being the product of a theft, which the providential drowsiness of his companions enabled him to perpetrate from the relics which Hildoin well knew were the property of his friend.

Lunison, on the contrary, swears that all this story is false, and that he himself was bribed by Hunus to allow him to steal what he pleased from the property confided to his own and his brother's care by their guest Ratleig. And the honest notary himself seems to have no hesitation about lying and stealing to any extent, where the acquisition of relics is the object in view.

For a parallel to these transactions one must read a police report of the doings of a "long firm" or of a set of horse-coupers ; yet Eginhard seems to be aware of nothing, but that he has been rather badly used by his friend Hildoin and the "nequissimus nebulo" Hunus.

It is not easy for a modern Protestant, still less for any one who has the least tincture of scientific culture, whether physical or historical, to picture to himself the state of mind of a man of the ninth century, however cultivated, enlightened, and sincere he may have been. His deepest convictions, his most cherished hopes, were bound up in the belief of the miraculous. Life was a constant battle between saints and demons for the possession of the souls of men. The most superstitious among our modern countrymen turn to supernatural agencies only when natural causes seem insufficient ; to Eginhard and his friends the supernatural was the rule, and the sufficiency of natural causes was allowed only when there was nothing to suggest others.

Moreover, it must be recollected that the possession of miracle-working relics was greatly coveted, not only on high but on very low grounds. To a man like Eginhard, the mere satisfaction of the religious sentiment was obviously a powerful attraction. But, more than this, the possession of such

a treasure was an immense practical advantage. If the saints were duly flattered and worshiped, there was no telling what benefits might result from their interposition on your behalf. For physical evils, access to the shrine was like the grant of the use of a universal pill and ointment manufactory ; and pilgrimages thereto might suffice to cleanse the performers from any amount of sin. A letter to Lupus, subsequently abbot of Ferrara, written while Eginhard was smarting under the grief caused by the loss of his much-loved wife Imma, affords a striking insight into the current view of the relation between the glorified saints and their worshippers. The writer shows that he is anything but satisfied with the way in which he has been treated by the blessed martyrs whose remains he has taken such pains to "convey" to Seligenstadt, and to honor there as they would never have been honored in their Roman obscurity :

It is an aggravation of my grief and a reopening of my wound, that our vows have been of no avail, and that the faith which we placed in the merits and intervention of the martyrs has been utterly disappointed.

We may admit, then, without impeachment of Eginhard's sincerity, or of his honor under all ordinary circumstances, that when piety, self-interest, the glory of the Church in general, and that of the church at Seligenstadt in particular, all pulled one way, even the work-a-day principles of morality were disregarded, and *a fortiori*, anything like proper investigation of the reality of the alleged miracles was thrown to the winds.

And if this was the condition of mind of such a man as Eginhard, what is it not legitimate to suppose may have been that of Deacon Deusdona, Lunison, Hunus, and company, thieves and cheats by their own confession ; or of the probably hysterical nun ; or of the professional beggars, for whose incapacity to walk and straighten themselves there is no guarantee but their own ? Who is to make sure that the exorcist of the demon Wiggo was not just such another priest as Hunus ; and is it not at least possible, when Eginhard's servants dreamed night after night in such a curiously coincident fashion, that a careful inquirer might have found they were very anxious to please their master ?

Quite apart from deliberate and conscious fraud (which is a rarer thing than is often supposed), people whose mythopoeic faculty is once stirred are capable of saying the thing that is not, and of acting as they should not, to an extent which is hardly

imaginable by persons who are not so easily affected by the contagion of blind faith. There is no falsity so gross that honest men, and, still more, virtuous women, anxious to promote a good cause, will not lend themselves to it without any clear consciousness of the moral bearings of what they are doing.

The cases of miraculously effected cures of which Eginhard is ocular witness appear to belong to classes of disease in which malinger is possible or hysteria presumable. Without modern means of diagnosis, the names given to them are quite worthless. One "miracle," however, in which the patient was cured by the mere sight of the church in which the relics of the blessed martyrs lay, is an unmistakable case of dislocation of the lower jaw in a woman; and it is obvious that, as not unfrequently happens in such accidents to weakly subjects, the jaw slipped suddenly back into place, perhaps in consequence of a jolt, as the woman rode toward the church. (Cap. v, 53.)*

There is also a good deal said about a very questionable blind man—one Albricus (Alberich?)—who, having been cured, not of his blindness, but of another disease under which he labored, took up his quarters at Seligenstadt, and came out as a prophet, inspired by the archangel Gabriel. Eginhard intimates that his prophecies were fulfilled; but, as he does not state exactly what they were or how they were accomplished, the statement must be accepted with much caution. It is obvious that he was not the man to hesitate to "ease" a prophecy until it flitted, if the credit of the shrine of his favorite saints could be increased by such a procedure. There is no impeachment of his honor in the supposition. The logic of the matter is quite simple, if somewhat sophistical. The holiness of the church of the martyrs guarantees the reality of the appearance of the archangel Gabriel there, and what the archangel says must be true. Therefore, if anything seem to be wrong, that must be the mistake of the transmitter; and, in justice to the archangel, it must be suppressed or set right. This sort of "reconciliation" is not unknown in quite modern times, and among people who would be very much shocked to be compared with a "benighted papist" of the ninth century.

The readers of this review are, I imagine, very largely composed of people who would

be shocked to be regarded as anything but enlightened Protestants. It is not unlikely that those of them who have accompanied me thus far may be disposed to say: "Well, this is all very amusing as a story; but what is the practical interest of it? We are not likely to believe in the miracles worked by the spolia of SS. Marcellinus and Petrus, or by those of any other saints in the Roman calendar."

The practical interest is this: If you do not believe in these miracles, recounted by a witness whose character and competency are firmly established, whose sincerity can not be doubted, and who appeals to his sovereign and other contemporaries as witnesses of the truth of what he says, in a document of which a MS. copy exists, probably dating within a century of the author's death, why do you profess to believe in stories of a like character which are found in documents, of the dates and of the authorship of which nothing is certainly determined, and no known copies of which come within two or three centuries of the events they record? If it be true that the four Gospels and the Acts were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, all that we know of these persons comes to nothing in comparison with our knowledge of Eginhard; and not only is there no proof that the traditional authors of these works wrote them, but very strong reasons to the contrary may be alleged. If, therefore, you refuse to believe that "Wiggo" was cast out of the possessed girl on Eginhard's authority, with what justice can you profess to believe that the legion of devils were cast out of the man among the tombs of the Gadarenes? And if, on the other hand, you accept Eginhard's evidence, why do you laugh at the supposed efficacy of relics and the saint-worship of the modern Romanists? It can not be pretended, in the face of all evidence, that the Jews of the year 30, or thereafter, were less imbued with the belief in the supernatural than were the Franks of the year A.D. 800. The same influences were at work in each case, and it is only reasonable to suppose that the results were the same. If the evidence of Eginhard is insufficient to lead reasonable men to believe in the miracles he relates, *a fortiori* the evidence afforded by the Gospels and the Acts must be so.*

But it may be said that no serious critic denies the genuineness of the four great

* Eginhard speaks with lofty contempt of the "eana ac superstitiosa præsumptio" of the poor woman's companions in trying to alleviate her sufferings with "herbe and frivolous incantations." Vain enough, no doubt, but the "muller-culm" might have returned the epithet "superstitious" with interest.

* Of course, there is nothing new in this argument; but it does not grow weaker by age. And the case of Eginhard is far more instructive than that of Augustine, because the former has so very frankly, though incidentally, revealed to us not only his own mental and moral habits, but those of the people about him.

Pauline Epistles—Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, and Romans—and that, in three out of these four, Paul lays claim to the power of working miracles.* Must we suppose, therefore, that the Apostle to the Gentiles has stated that which is false? But to how much does this so-called claim amount? It may mean much or little. Paul nowhere tells us what he did in this direction, and, in his sore need to justify his assumption of apostleship against the sneers of his enemies, it is hardly likely that, if he had any very striking cases to bring forward, he would have neglected evidence so well calculated to put them to shame.

And, without the slightest impeachment of Paul's veracity, we must further remember that his strongly marked mental characteristics, displayed in unmistakable fashion in these Epistles, are anything but those which would justify us in regarding him as a critical witness respecting matters of fact, or as a trustworthy interpreter of their significance. When a man testifies to a miracle, he not only states a fact, but he adds an interpretation of the fact. We may admit his evidence as to the former, and yet think his opinion as to the latter worthless. If Eginhard's calm and objective narrative of the historical events of his time is no guarantee for the soundness of his judgment where the supernatural is concerned, the fervid rhetoric of the Apostle of the Gentiles, his absolute confidence in the "inner light," and the extraordinary conceptions of the nature and requirements of logical proof which he betrays in page after page of his Epistles, afford still less security.

There is a comparative modern man who shared to the full Paul's trust in the "inner light," and who, though widely different from the fiery evangelist of Tarsus in various obvious particulars, yet, if I am not mistaken, shares his deepest characteristics. I speak of George Fox, who separated himself from the current Protestantism of England in the seventeenth century as Paul separated himself from the Judaism of the first century, at the bidding of the "inner light"—who went through persecutions as serious as those which Paul enumerates, who was beaten, stoned, cast out for dead, imprisoned nine times, sometimes for long periods, in perils on land and perils at sea. George Fox was an even more widely traveled missionary, and his success in founding congregations, and his energy in visiting them, not merely in Great Britain and Ireland and the West India Islands, but on the continent of Europe and that of North

America, was no less remarkable. A few years after Fox began to preach there were reckoned to be a thousand Friends in prison in the various jails of England; at his death, less than fifty years after the foundation of the sect, there were seventy thousand of them in the United Kingdom. The cheerfulness with which these people—women as well as men—underwent martyrdom in this country and in the New England States is one of the most remarkable facts in the history of religion.

No one who reads the voluminous autobiography of "Honest George" can doubt the man's utter truthfulness; and though, in his multitudinous letters, he but rarely rises far above the incoherent commonplaces of a street preacher, there can be no question of his power as a speaker, nor any doubt as to the dignity and attractiveness of his personality, or of his possession of a large amount of practical good sense and governing faculty.

But that George Fox had full faith in his own powers as a miracle-worker, the following passage of his autobiography (to which others might be added) demonstrates:

Now after I was set at liberty from Nottingham gaol (where I had been kept prisoner a pretty long time) I traveled as before, in the work of the Lord. And coming to Mansfield Woodhouse, there was a distracted woman under a doctor's hand, with her hair let loose all about her ears; and he was about to let her blood, she being first bound, and many people being about her, holding her by violence; but he could get no blood from her. And I desired them to unbind her and let her alone; for they could not touch the spirit in her by which she was tormented. So they did unbind her, and I was moved to speak to her, and in the name of the Lord to bid her be quiet and still. And she was so. And the Lord's power settled her mind and she mended; and afterwards received the truth and continued in it to her death. And the Lord's name was honored; to whom the glory of all his works belongs. Many great and wonderful things were wrought by the heavenly power in those days. For the Lord made bare his omnipotent arm and manifested his power to the astonishment of many; by the healing virtue whereof many have been delivered from great infirmities and the devils were made subject through his name: of which particular instances might be given beyond what this unbelieving age is able to receive or bear.*

It needs no long study of Fox's writings, however, to arrive at the conviction that the distinction between subjective and objective verities had not the same place in his mind as it has in that of ordinary mortals. When an ordinary person would say "I thought so and so," or "I made up my mind to do so and so," George Fox says "it was opened to me," or "at the command of God I did

* See 1 Cor. xii, 10-28; 2 Cor. vi, 12; Rom. xv, 19.

* "A Journal or Historical Account of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, and Christian Experiences, etc., of George Fox," ed. i, 1694, pp. 27, 28.

so and so." "Then at the command of God on the ninth day of the seventh month 1643 [Fox being just nineteen] I left my relations and brake off all familiarity or friendship with young or old." "About the beginning of the year 1647 I was moved of the Lord to go into Darbyshire." Fox hears voices and he sees visions, some of which he brings before the reader with apocalyptic power in simple and strong English, alike untutored and undefiled, of which, like John Bunyan, his contemporary, he was a master.

"And one morning, as I was sitting by the fire, a great cloud came over me, and a temptation beset me: and I sate still. And it was said, *All things come by Nature*. And the elements and stars came over me; so that I was in a manner quite clouded with it. . . . And, as I sate still under it, and let it alone, a living hope arose in me, and a true voice arose in me which said, *There is a living God who made all things*. And immediately the cloud and the temptation vanished away, and life rose over it all, and my heart was glad and I praised the Living God" (p. 13).

If George Fox could speak as he proves in this and some other passages he could write, his astounding influence on the contemporaries of Milton and of Cromwell is no mystery. But this modern reproduction of the ancient prophet, with his "Thus saith the Lord," "This is the work of the Lord," steeped in supernaturalism and glorying in blind faith, is the mental antipodes of the philosopher, founded in naturalism and a fanatic for evidence, to whom these affirmations inevitably suggest the previous question: "How do you know that the Lord saith it?" "How do you know that the Lord doeth it?" and who is compelled to demand that rational ground for belief without which, to the man of science, assent is merely an immoral pretense.

And it is this rational ground of belief which the writers of the Gospels, no less than Paul, and Eginhard, and Fox, so little dream of offering that they would regard the demand for it as a kind of blasphemy.

IX.

AGNOSTICISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

BY PROF. THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

Nemo ergo ex me scire querat, quod me nescire scio, nisi forte ut nescire discat.—AUGUSTINUS, *De Civ. Dei*, xii, 7.

CONTRIVERSY, like most things in this world, has a good and a bad side. On the

good side, it may be said that it stimulates the wits, tends to clear the mind, and often helps those engaged in it to get a better grasp of their subject than they had before; while, mankind being essentially fighting animals, a contest leads the public to interest themselves in questions to which, otherwise, they would give but a languid attention. On the bad side, controversy is rarely found to sweeten the temper, and generally tends to degenerate into an exchange of more or less effective sarcasms. Moreover, if it is long continued, the original and really important issues are apt to become obscured by disputes on the collateral and relatively insignificant questions which have cropped up in the course of the discussion. No doubt both of these aspects of controversy have manifested themselves in the course of the debate which has been in progress, for some months, in these pages. So far as I may have illustrated the second, I express repentance and desire absolution; and I shall endeavor to make amends for any foregone lapses by an endeavor to exhibit only the better phase in these concluding remarks.

The present discussion has arisen out of the use, which has become general in the last few years, of the terms "agnostic" and "agnosticism."

The people who call themselves "agnostics" have been charged with doing so because they have not the courage to declare themselves "infidels." It has been insinuated that they have adopted a new name in order to escape the unpleasantness which attaches to their proper denomination. To this wholly erroneous imputation I have replied by showing that the term "agnostic" did, as a matter of fact, arise in a manner which negatives it; and my statement has not been, and can not be, refuted. Moreover, speaking for myself, and without impugning the right of any other person to use the term in another sense, I further say that agnosticism is not properly described as a "negative" creed, nor indeed as a creed of any kind, except in so far as it expresses absolute faith in the validity of a principle which is as much ethical as intellectual. This principle may be stated in various ways, but they all amount to this: that it is wrong for a man to say that he is certain of the objective truth of any proposition unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty. This is what agnosticism asserts; and, in my opinion, it is all that is essential to agnosticism. That which agnostics deny and repudiate as immoral is the contrary doctrine, that there

* Let no one therefore seek to know from me what I know I do not know, except in order to learn not to know.

are propositions which men ought to believe, without logically satisfactory evidence; and that reprobation ought to attach to the profession of disbelief in such inadequately supported propositions. The justification of the agnostic principle lies in the success which follows upon its application, whether in the field of natural or in that of civil history; and in the fact that, so far as these topics are concerned, no sane man thinks of denying its validity.

Still speaking for myself, I add that, though agnosticism is not, and can not be, a creed, except in so far as its general principle is concerned; yet that the application of that principle results in the denial of, or the suspension of judgment concerning, a number of propositions respecting which our contemporary ecclesiastical "agnostics" profess entire certainty. And in so far as these ecclesiastical persons can be justified in the old-established custom (which many nowadays think more honoured, in the breach than the observance) of using opprobrious names to those who differ from them, I fully admit their right to call me and those who think with me "infidels"; all I have ventured to urge is that they must not expect us to speak of ourselves by that title.

The extent of the region of the uncertain, the number of the problems the investigation of which ends in a verdict of not proven, will vary according to the knowledge and the intellectual habits of the individual agnostic. I do not very much care to speak of anything as unknowable. What I am sure about is that there are many topics about which I know nothing, and which, so far as I can see, are out of reach of my faculties. But whether these things are knowable by any one else is exactly one of those matters which is beyond my knowledge, though I may have a tolerably strong opinion as to the probabilities of the case. Relatively to myself, I am quite sure that the region of uncertainty—the nebulous country in which words play the part of realities—is far more extensive than I could wish. Materialism and idealism; theism and atheism; the doctrine of the soul and its mortality or immortality—appear in the history of philosophy like the shades of Scandinavian heroes, eternally slaying one another and eternally coming to life again in a metaphysical "Nifelheim." It is getting on for twenty-five centuries, at least, since mankind began seriously to give their minds to these topics. Generation after generation, philosophy has been doomed to roll the stone up hill; and, just as all the world swore it was at the top, down it has rolled

to the bottom again. All this is written in innumerable books; and he who will toil through them will discover that the stone is just where it was when the work began. Hume saw this; Kant saw it; since their time, more and more eyes have been cleansed of the films which prevented them from seeing it; until now the weight and number of those who refuse to be the prey of verbal mystification has begun to tell in practical life.

It was inevitable that a conflict should arise between agnosticism and theology; or rather I ought to say between agnosticism and ecclesiasticism. For theology, the science, is one thing; and ecclesiasticism, the championship of a foregone conclusion* as to the truth of a particular form of theology, is another. With scientific theology, agnosticism has no quarrel. On the contrary, the agnostic, knowing too well the influence of prejudice and idiosyncrasy, even on those who desire most earnestly to be impartial, can wish for nothing more urgently than that the scientific theologian should not only be at perfect liberty to thrash out the matter in his own fashion, but that he should, if he can, find flaws in the agnostic position, and, even if demonstration is not to be had, that he should put, in their full force, the grounds of the conclusions he thinks probable. The scientific theologian admits the agnostic principle, however widely his results may differ from those reached by the majority of agnostics.

But, as between agnosticism and ecclesiasticism, or, as our neighbors across the Channel call it, clericalism, there can be neither peace nor truce. The cleric asserts that it is morally wrong not to believe certain propositions, whatever the results of a strict scientific investigation of the evidence of these propositions. He tells us that "religious error is, in itself, of an immoral nature."† He declares that he has prejudged certain conclusions, and looks upon those who show cause for arrest of judgment as emissaries of Satan. It necessarily follows that, for him, the attainment of faith, not the ascertainment of truth, is the highest aim of mental life. And, on careful analysis of the nature of this faith, it will too often be found to be not the mystic process of unity with the divine, understood by the religious enthusiast—but that which the candid simplicity of a Sunday scholar once

(To be continued.)

* "Let us maintain, before we have proved. This seeming paradox is the secret of happiness." (Dr. Newman, "Tract 85," p. 85.)

† Dr. Newman, "Essay on Development," p. 357.

GOODLY WORDS.

Readings from the Mystics, selected by C. H. A. BJORRE-GAARD, of the Astor Library.

When the disciple has ceased to hear the many, he may discern the ONE—the inner sound which kills the outer.

Then only, not till then, shall he forsake the region of *Asat*, the false, to come unto the realm of *Sat*, the true.

Before the soul can see, the Harmony within must be attained, and fleshly eyes be rendered blind to all illusion.

Before the soul can hear, the image (man) has to become as deaf to roarings as to whispers, to cries of bellowing elephants as to the silvery buzzing of the golden fire-fly.

Before the soul can comprehend and may remember, she must unto the Silent Speaker be united, just as the form to which the clay is modelled is first united with the potter's mind.

The Self of matter and the SELF of Spirit can never meet. One of the twain must disappear; there is no place for both.

Ere thy Soul's mind can understand, the bud of personality must be crushed out, the worm of sense destroyed past resurrection.

Let not the fierce Sun dry one tear of pain before thou wipest it from the sufferer's eye. But let each burning human tear drop on thy heart and there remain, nor ever brush it off, until the pain that caused it is removed. These tears, O thou of heart most merciful, these are the streams that irrigate the fields of charity immortal. 'Tis on such soil that grows the midnight blossom of Buddha (viz., Adeptship), more difficult to find, more rare to view than is the flower of the Vogay tree.

Help Nature and work on with her; and Nature will regard thee as one of her creators and make obeisance.

And she will open wide before thee the portals of her secret chambers, lay bare before thy gaze the treasures hidden in the very depths of her pure virgin bosom. Unsullied by the hand of matter she shows her treasures only to the eye of Spirit—the eye which never closes, the eye for which there is no veil in all her kingdoms.

THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE. *Translated and Annotated by H. P. B.* London, n.d.

There is only one way of escape. . . . Turn round, and instead of standing against the forces, join them; become one with Nature, and go easily upon her path. Do not resist or resent the circumstances of life any more than the plants resent the rain and the wind. Then suddenly, to your own amazement, you find you have time and strength to spare, to use in the great battle which it is inevitable every man must fight,—that in himself, that which leads to his own conquest. . . . Cultivate, I say, and neglect nothing. Only remember, all the while you tend and water, that you are impudently usurping the tasks of Nature herself. Having usurped her work, you must carry it through until you have reached a point when she has no power to punish you, when you are not afraid of her, but can with a bold front return her her own. She laughs in her sleeve, the mighty mother, watching you with covert, laughing eye, ready relentlessly to cast the whole of your work into the dust if you do but give her the chance, if you turn idler and grow careless. The idler is the father of the madman in the sense that the child is the father of the man. Nature has put

her vast hand on him and crushed the whole edifice. The gardener and his rose-trees are alike broken and stricken by the great storm which her movement has created; they lie helpless till the sand is swept over them and they are buried in a weary wilderness. From this desert spot Nature herself will recreate, and will use the ashes of the man who dared to face her as indifferently as the withered leaves of his plants. His body, soul, and spirit are all alike claimed by her.

MABEL COLLINS, *Through the Gates of Gold*. Boston, 1887.

THERE IS ONE ACTOR IN ALL ACTION; HIM KNOW!

Digest well not only that food which enters thy mouth, but also that food which enters thine ears and thine eyes, and at every touch.

As the pains of indigestion accompany the too hasty eater, so the sorrows of misunderstanding accompany the too hasty hearer, or seer, or toucher.

Judge not as impure, or unfit, or unclean, anything that thou dost hear, or see, or touch; for this is too hasty judgment.

I, who made the heavens and the earth, make all things that thou dost see, and speak all sounds that thou dost hear, and write all words that thou dost read. What thing, what sound, what book, shalt thou choose as mine? Choose all, and thou wilt choose aright.

But he who chooses some, rejecting others, digests not all his food; and is like the hasty eater, who must repent anon.

Digest all thoughts and things as wholesome food which I prepare for all. They are the meats and the drinks of my body and of my blood. Whoso rejecteth aught rejecteth mine; and whoso rejecteth mine cannot be partaker with me in heaven.

But I long for thee, and call thee to thy Supper and thy Rest. I turn from thee never; but when thou dost hunger and thirst, my meat and my drink are ready for thy taking.

Behold my works, they all are meat; and my thoughts, they all are drink! Accept them all as mine; then they all are thine; and Thou and I are One.

U. R. LEAFLET, May, 1890.

Extract from BUDDHA'S FIRST SERMON. *Translated by J. W. Rhys Davids.*

"Birth," said the Teacher, "is attended with pain; and so are decay and disease and death. Union with the unpleasant is painful, and separation from the pleasant; and any craving that is unsatisfied is a condition of sorrow. Now, all this amounts, in short, to this, that wherever there are the conditions of individuality, there are the conditions of sorrow. This is the First Truth, the truth about sorrow.

"The cause of sorrow is the thirst or craving which causes the renewal of individual existence, is accompanied by evil, and is ever seeking satisfaction, now here, now there—that is to say, the craving either for sensual gratifications, or for continued existence, or for the cessation of existence. This is the Noble Truth concerning the origin of sorrow.

"Deliverance from sorrow is the complete destruction, the laying aside, the getting rid of, the being free from, the harbouring no longer of, this passionate craving. This is the Noble Truth concerning the destruction of sorrow.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

CHRONICON EPHRATENSE. A History of the Community of Seventh-Day Baptists at Ephrata, Lancaster County, Pa., by "Lamech and Agrippa." Translated from the original German by J. MAX HARK, D.D., Lancaster, Pa. Published by S. H. Zahm & Co., 1889. Svo. \$2.50.

The appearance of an English version of the *Chronicon Ephratense* is an event of some interest to students of American Church History. The original, which was printed in the convent at Ephrata, Pennsylvania, in 1786, had become excessively rare, so that not more than twenty copies were known to exist, and these were jealously guarded by their possessors. The Ephrata imprint is fascinating to book-collectors; and local antiquarians of all kinds were anxious to possess a book which was known to have been printed with home-made ink on home-made paper. To scholars the *Chronicon* was known to be a storehouse of information concerning the curious forms of German mysticism which flourished in some parts of Pennsylvania in the last century, but very few had enjoyed the privilege of consulting it.

To use this curious book to advantage, it was not enough to be familiar with the German language as it is now studied and spoken. The *Chronicon* was evidently not the work of a practised hand, and its author had probably not even heard the names of the great masters of literature. A German peasant of the last century, with little general information, but thoroughly steeped in the mysticism of Boehme and Beissel, would naturally employ words which are not in the dictionaries, and turns of expression which it is not easy to follow.

In translating the *Chronicon*, Dr. Hark has been remarkably successful. It has evidently been a labor of love, and his version is, therefore, not only accurate, but preserves much of the quaintness of the original. The translator has added a few notes, but we wish there had been more of them, as the book contains many allusions which are obscure to most modern readers. Thus, for instance, we are told, on page 73, that the "doctores" in Germany warned their American correspondents that the religious movement at Ephrata would probably result in "a new Evische Rotte." Here, we think, it might have been well to explain that this is an allusion to a sect founded in 1702 by Eva von Buttlar, which was supposed to

represent the extreme of religious fanaticism.

The authorship of the *Chronicon* is, on the title-page, ascribed to Brothers "Lamech and Agrippa;" but we know from contemporary sources that it was "Lamech" who wrote the book, which was found in manuscript in his cell, after his death. "Agrippa" composed the preface, and may have modified a sentence here and there; but his style is so peculiar that we may conclude with certainty that no considerable part of the book was written by him. The translator says: "Who 'Lamech and Agrippa,' the authors of the *Chronicle*, really were, is utterly unknown. . . . It is a secret that has been well kept. . . . The future is not likely ever to reveal it." We agree with this statement so far as "Agrippa" is concerned; but are inclined to believe that the identity of "Lamech" may be determined with reasonable certainty. There is a scarce book—entitled "The Life of Ezekiel Sangmeister"—which was written by a discontented monk, and hidden behind a panel in his cell. In this book, which was found and published in numbers in 1825, the writer frequently refers to the author of the *Chronicon*, but always by his monastic name, Lamech. Having gained access to the manuscript of the *Chronicon* at a time when it was not supposed it would ever be published, Sangmeister took brief notes of its contents, though not generally in the exact language of the original. These notes are reproduced in his book, generally accompanied by unfavorable comments. On page 13 we find the following statement: "In 1725 Brother Lamech, who had previously been a Baptist, joined the community;" and on referring to the corresponding passage in the *Chronicon*, we read that "the Baptists were not a little offended, in that in 1725 one of their proselytes, Jan Mayle, went over to the new congregation." From these parallel passages, in conjunction with others which we have no room to cite, we conclude that "Lamech" and Jan Mayle were identical, and that the latter—who is known to have been an influential member of the community—was the author of the *Chronicon Ephratense*.

The work very properly begins with a sketch of the religious and social condition of Germany at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The great Pietistic revival, which had been inaugurated by such men as Spener and Jean de Labadie, had not yet spent its power; but its adherents had already separated into two widely contrasted parties. The first of these—the Pietists

fanati-

is, on
Lamech
contem-
h" who
manu-
Agrip-
y have
but his
clude
part of
e trans-
rippa,'
were, is
et that
e is not
e with
is con-
that the
rmined
scarce
Sang-
discon-
anel in
found
writer
Chron-
name,
o the
time
ver be
otes of
n the
notes
ly ac-
On
ment :
d pre-
mmu-
pond-
d that
ed, in
e, Jan
ion."

with a
dition
neigh-
rival,
en as
t yet
d al-
asted
etists

proper—remained in the established churches, in the hope of awakening them to a new life; the second party was generally known as the Mystics, and included sectarians of every variety. Some of the latter were satisfied to be members of the so-called "Philadelphian societies," in which they studied such works as Boehme's "Morgenröthe," fondly imagining that in them they beheld the prophetic dawns of a brighter era. Others became associated with the scattered fragments of the persecuted Anabaptists, who in secluded valleys cultivated a form of mysticism peculiar to themselves; and from this association sprang many curious sects—Inspirationists, Ronsdorfers, Ellerians, and others. In 1708 Alexander Mack founded, at Schwarzenau, the society of Baptist "Brethren," who subsequently emigrated in a body to America, where they have greatly prospered, and are now particularly known as "Dunkers" or "Dunkards." Many of the Mystics were strongly inclined to socialism, and the Labadists and others seriously attempted to revive mediæval monasticism. Indeed, there are socialistic communities even now which, though not strictly monastic, remotely derive their origin from this period of German mysticism.

Conrad Beissel, the founder of the "Order of the Solitary," at Ephrata, appears in some respects to have resembled the founders of the great monastic orders of the Roman Catholic Church. Born at Ebersbach in the Palatinate, in 1690, in the humblest circumstances, he was from his childhood impressed with the idea that he would be called to great things. Though his opportunities for acquiring an education were limited, he did not remain ignorant. He acquired, at any rate, much general information, and became a good musician and a fluent writer in prose and verse. Above all, he possessed an undefinable power, which rendered him a leader of men; so that during his whole career we find men who were vastly his superiors in intellect and learning freely submitting to his guidance, and humbly following him in all his vagaries.

After his conversion, in 1715, Beissel became more and more eccentric. If he did not, like St. Francis, preach to the birds and fishes, many of his religious utterances were hardly less unusual. His piety assumed the form of strict asceticism, and he began to declare the glories of celibacy, "being convinced that marriage came in with the fall." These extravagancies naturally brought him into collision with the authorities of the Reformed Church, of

which he had previously been a member, and he found it advisable to leave his native land.

We have no room to tell the story of Beissel's pilgrimage, as it is related in the *Chronicon*. Working at his trade, as a baker, though without accepting regular wages, he visited many places "to commune with awakened souls." Gradually his mind became fixed in the old Anabaptist notion that "present inspiration is more highly to be commended than the written word;" and as he was convinced of his personal inspiration, he no longer needed the guidance of others.

It was with the purpose of living the life of a hermit, somewhere in the wilderness, that Beissel, in 1720, emigrated to America. In an unsettled part of Lancaster County, Pa., he built his humble hermitage, but was not long suffered to possess the joys of solitude. The fame of his sanctity spread through the land, and a little company of mystics gathered around him, and prayed him to become their religious leader.

At this time Beissel attended a religious meeting conducted by Peter Becker, the "Dunker" preacher of Germantown, and received baptism at his hands. At first, it is said, he was in great perplexity whether he ought to be baptized by this man, but it finally occurred to him that "Christ himself had suffered himself to be baptized by one who was less than himself." The union with the "Dunkers," however, remained unbroken but a single day. It was almost immediately discovered that Beissel had declared himself in favor of the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, and to this observance the "Dunkers" would by no means agree. His views with reference to celibacy were also objectionable, and the result was a schism which was never healed.

The story of the monks and nuns of Ephrata, as related in the *Chronicon*, is not uninteresting. It is, however, almost a repetition of the history of many monastic institutions. The most devout of the brethren and sisters determined to adopt a monastic rule, and, curiously enough, accepted that of the Capuchins. They wore coarse garments, and hoods that almost covered their faces. Except in the coldest weather they walked barefoot. No meat ever appeared on their tables, and their simple fare was served on wooden platters. At night they slept on rude wooden benches, with no pillow but a wooden billet, and often at midnight they were called to engage in worship which continued until morning. In 1732 the monastic buildings began to be

erected. They were undertaken in faith, but the means for their completion were not lacking. Though entirely destitute of ornament, these buildings were large, and, in a certain sense, imposing. Several of them are still standing, though others have long since disappeared.

In the management of the institution, Beissel manifested great shrewdness. Though he observed the monastic rule in all its particulars, he lived in a separate house, and never condescended to familiarity with the brethren. He bore the title of Superintendent, and was addressed as "Father;" but preferred to be known by his monastic name as "Friedsam Gottrecht." He was naturally regarded with unbounded reverence, and it was currently believed that he possessed the power of working miracles.

The temporal management of the monastery was committed entirely to the Prior, who was elected by the brethren. Israel Eckerlin, known in religion as "Brother Onesimus," was perhaps the ablest man who held this office, and under his guidance the order rapidly grew wealthy. He made the brethren toil like slaves, it is said; and there can be no doubt that if he had remained in office his far-reaching plans would have been splendidly realized. Unfortunately, he was ambitious, and sought to supplant the Superintendent by making him a sort of *pontifex maximus*, who was to be profoundly revered but deprived of all power. Beissel endured all this for a while; but in due time his silent influence prevailed, and Onesimus was driven forth into the wilderness.

John Peter Miller, known as "Brother Jaebez," subsequently held the office of Prior for many years, and suited the Superintendent much better. He had been sent to America as a missionary by the Reformed consistory of Heidelberg, and was a thoroughly educated man; but having come under the influence of Beissel, he renounced the ministry and embraced the ascetic life. It was mainly under his influence and direction that Ephrata became an important literary centre.

Beissel had certainly studied monasticism to some purpose. Every member of the fraternity was kept constantly at work on the fields, or in the mills or workshops. The sisters were also supplied with suitable work, so that there was little time for idle gossip. To occupy the long winter evenings there was a writing-school and a singing-school. Specimens of calligraphy have been preserved which are exceedingly beautiful. The music cultivated at Ephrata is minute-

ly described in the *Chronicon*, and it must certainly have been charming. In those days enthusiasm for poetry and music was unbounded. Beissel himself was the author of four hundred and forty-one hymns, and composed more than a thousand tunes. A whole series of Ephrata hymn-books dates from this period. Three of them were printed in Roman type by Benjamin Franklin—the earliest in 1730; but this style of typography was not acceptable, and in 1739 Christopher Saur printed for the "Brethren" a larger collection of hymns, entitled "Zionitischer Weyrauch's Huegel oder Myrrhen Berg" ("Zion's Hill of Incense, or Mountain of Myrrh"). The latter was the first book issued by its celebrated publisher, and, indeed, the first book printed in America in German characters. It is dedicated "to all the solitary turtle-doves that coo in the wilderness;" and the turtle-doves of Ephrata themselves certainly kept up a billing and cooing that made the forests ring.

In 1742 the Ephrata Society purchased a press, and began the publication of a long series of volumes bearing its imprint. There are at least seventy-five of these; but the most important is "Der Blutige Schaulplatz" (1748), which is generally known as the "Baptist Martyr-Book." This immense folio is a translation into German of a work first published in Holland in 1660. It is by far the largest book printed in America during the colonial period.

There are probably few modern readers who would be interested in the "Theological Lectures" of Conrad Beissel, as they were printed at Ephrata. They are full of the "fog-spirit" which was distinctive of the writings of Boehme and Gichtel. As in all the mystical books published at Ephrata, the celibate life is glorified as "the wooing of the beautiful virgin, Sophia;" and to this personification of divine wisdom the most endearing epithets are constantly applied. Occasionally, however, we find a passage which is not only intelligible but brilliant, and we may, indeed, sometimes be surprised to discover that Beissel has anticipated Schelling or Hegel.

The *Chronicon Ephratense* concludes with the death of Beissel, in 1768, though we might wish that "Lamech" or "Agrippa" had continued the story to a later date. We know, however, that soon after the death of the founder the society began to decline. In its best days it had numbered about three hundred members, of whom from seventy-five to one hundred had taken monastic vows. Gradually the order declined, and after the death of Miller, the last Prior, in

1796, it practically ceased to exist. In 1814 the property was legally transferred to the society of "The German Seventh-day Baptists," which now numbers less than fifty members.

The *Chronicon Ephratense*, as translated by Dr. Hark and published by S. H. Zahm & Co., is a handsome octavo, well printed, and bound in a style that is suggestive of the antique. A few copies have been printed on large paper for extra illustration. The publication of such a book, in these days, is in itself a curiosity. We hope, however, that it will be appreciated, not only by the lovers of the quaint and curious, but by all who are interested in the early religious history of our country.

JOSEPH HENRY DUBBS.

Lancaster, Pa.

LES FRÈRES GIBERT. Deux pasteurs du Désert et du Refuge (1722-1817). Par Daniel Bénéit, pasteur. Toulouse: Société des Livres Religieux, 1889. Pp. 429, 12mo.

The author of this volume has within the past few years given to the world four or five interesting and valuable books all having to do with one of the least known, but by no means least important periods of French Protestant history—the period of a little over a century elapsing between the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, and the Edict of Toleration of 1787. Three of these were monographs treating respectively of Jacques Roger and Desubas, who were put to death for preaching the Gospel, and of Marie Durand, who endured an almost lifelong imprisonment in the terrible Tour de Constance, at Aigues Mortes. More recently M. Bénéit has contributed an introduction to the valuable edition of the great French Martyrology of Jean Crespin, brought out by the Toulouse Religious Book Society. The volume before us covers another part of the same field, with which the author has made himself unusually familiar in the course of his earlier investigations, and seems to us to surpass in general interest and value all his previous productions. The two brothers Gibert were striking characters among the intrepid pastors that figured in the middle and the latter part of the eighteenth century, and to whose fearless and self-sacrificing labors is due, under God, the complete resuscitation of the churches of the Huguenots. Neither one was of the class of the pioneers in this work. The honor of restoring Protestantism belongs to the ministers of the generation immediately preceding, to Antoine Court and his associ-

ates. Jean Louis Gibert and his younger brother, Étienne, were of those who, coming to the help of the survivors of that early band, contributed powerfully to consolidate their work, and to carry it forward to such marvellous success, that, in a fast-day sermon preached in 1784, only one year before the centenary of the Revocation and three years before the return of toleration, Étienne Gibert was able to state that, despite persecution of the most persistent and atrocious character, there were in France at that time not less than five hundred Protestant churches, with one hundred and fifty pastors, and at the most moderate computation a million and a half of adherents (p. 310). How this result was effected is a curious and very interesting story, which cannot even be sketched here. The prime actors were, of course, the courageous pastors, living a life of continual peril, watched by the government, tracked by paid spies, wandering about in strange disguises, liable at any moment to be denounced by false brethren and, if caught, to be speedily tried and broken alive on the wheel; yet many of them escaping after the most singular adventures. And yet the very government that persecuted them respected their probity, and did not disdain occasionally to resort to them for help in restraining or insuring the submission of their flocks. In such cases their success was greater than it was in securing the aid of the clergy of the established Church in controlling its laity. Truth is frequently stranger than fiction. About 1756, profiting by a temporary abatement in the persecutions exercised against them, the Protestants of the western province of Saintonge made bold to begin to meet for worship with greater courage and more publicity than before. They even established a number of *maisons d'oraison* (houses of prayer), differing little from the traditional Protestant *temples*, or churches of their ancestors, except that they were much smaller and externally had only the appearance of common dwelling-houses. In November of that year the royal intendant of Saintonge, loath to resort to violent measures, which might have led to an open disturbance of the peace, sent word to Jean Louis Gibert requesting him to acquiesce in the demolition of two of the places of worship, in which case the others would be allowed to stand. Gibert absolutely refused to consent. At this very time Gibert was under sentence, pronounced by the intendant who solicited his intervention, to be hung for the discharge of his functions as a Protestant minister. The Huguenots of Sain-

tonge, we are told, continued to go in crowds to the services held twice on every Lord's Day (pp. 106, 107).

To American readers the chief interest associated with the elder Gibert resides in the fact that, tired of the unreasonable persistence of the French Government in a system of persecution condemned by the spirit of the age and prolonged only from a foolish desire to shield the memory of Louis XIV. from merited opprobrium, this pastor led a colony of his countrymen to the shores of South Carolina. This emigration, which is briefly referred to in Ramsay's "History of South Carolina" and elsewhere, is described at considerable length in the ninth and tenth chapters of M. Bénéoit's book. The colonists made their way as best they could to England, and, after about two months' futile attempts to clear from the tempestuous shores of the Channel, set sail from Plymouth on February 23d, 1764. They reached Charleston on April 14th. M. Bénéoit incorporates in his book many interesting particulars respecting the successful founding of the French establishment of New Bordeaux, so called from the capital of the province of Guyenne, of which many of the colonists were natives. The narrative has the advantage of novelty, and is supported by letters and other original documents, which may be read in the appendix. Jean Louis Gibert was accompanied in his colony by a second pastor, his brother-in-law, Pierre Boutiton. The project of emigration was not looked upon with much favor by the French churches at home. They undoubtedly felt that, in view of the certainty that the reign of persecution could not last much longer, it was not best further to weaken the churches that had withstood such a protracted period of trial by removing their members to the other side of the Atlantic.

The younger brother, Étienne, has a closer connection with the religious life of France. His biography throws a little light upon the declension of doctrinal orthodoxy and vital piety during the second half of the eighteenth century. The progress of such movements is often very difficult to trace with accuracy. Forms of sound words are retained long after they have ceased to be cordially accepted, and the professors of creeds would frequently be shocked did they realize how far they have departed from the sentiments of the authors of their standards. Among the French Protestants of the middle of the last century the influence of the writings of Rousseau and Voltaire was not inappreciable. As persecution began to di-

minish, the zeal of many of the pastors, for the truths in defence of which so much suffering had been willingly undergone, also perceptibly abated. Some of the collections of sermons that have come down to us testify to the extent to which the preaching of morality had usurped the place of the proclamation of the doctrines of the Cross. The theological seminary founded by Antoine Court at Lausanne, inestimable as had been the benefits it had conferred upon France, now became, by the lukewarmness or positive unsoundness of its teachers, a source of positive injury. Étienne Gibert appears to have left the seminary, as he had entered it, an unconverted man. He had narrowly escaped the Socinianism into which he had at one time been in danger of falling, and his views of the divinity of Christ had been settled, thanks to the careful study of Abbadie's works; but he had been several years pastor at Bordeaux before he experienced the change which gave to his future life an entirely new character. There is reason to believe that his intercourse with some Moravian Brethren sojourning in France was specially fruitful of good to him. The alteration of his views and the fresh zeal that entered into his preaching could not long remain unperceived. His hearers, even the consistory itself, took alarm. Accustomed to discourses that were addressed to the intellect, they were restless under sermons that dwelt without ceasing upon the necessity of regeneration by the influences of the Holy Spirit. They formulated their complaints under several heads—that he employed the Heidelberg Catechism (having had an edition of it printed without consulting the elders) in preference to the standard catechisms of Saurin and Osterwald; that he had maintained that man is unable to do any good action before faith, and that philosophy is useless in religion; that he was always coming back to one point—that is, to Jesus Christ, and that he was too intimate with the Moravian Brethren. It was all in vain that Gibert undertook to prove from the Bible the truth of his doctrines, and from the Confession of Faith of the French churches, that his views were identical with those of the fathers. The consistory, after many conferences with Gibert, insisted that he should either resign his pulpit or promise never again to treat in his sermons of the doctrines of grace or of the impotence of man without the help of God. The provincial synod, to which Gibert appealed, while taking good care not to condemn his utterances directly, supported the consistory of Bordeaux in its most objection-

able positions, and, ostensibly in the interests of peace, removed him from his present parish while authorizing him to labor elsewhere in Saintonge. Throughout the whole affair the members of the synod displayed a suspicious timidity, which reached its climax when it was learned that Gibert had prepared an extended paper, fifty-six pages in length, in justification of his doctrinal views. The synod refused to enter into the ultimate merits of the question, "in view of the delicacy of the matter," and forbade the pastor to circulate his paper in the church of Bordeaux.

These events, for a fuller discussion of which we must refer the reader to the very interesting volume of M. Benoît, occurred in 1770. The elder Gibert had been driven into exile by persecution; his younger brother expatriated himself in consequence of the disappointment of his hopes of preaching the truth as he held it in his native land. The remainder of his life he spent in Great Britain and its dependencies. He became a faithful clergyman of the Church of England, and from 1794 to 1815 was rector of the parish of Saint Pierre Port, on the island of Guernsey. The list of his writings, in which Christian Apologetics hold a prominent place, is a long one.

HENRY M. BAIRD.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

Anderson, J. W. D. [Compiler.] *The Kansas Methodist Pulpit. A Collection of Twenty-four Sermons, by Bishop W. X. Nide and various members of the four Kansas Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* Topeka, Kan.: Crane, 1890. Pp. vi., 297, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

Aquin, Thomas von. *Die Kath. Wahrheit oder die theol. Summa, deutsch wiedergegeben v. Dr. C. M. Schneider.* 11. Bd. *Supplementarische Abhandlung zum 3. Th. der Summa. Die Natur und die Gnade oder die heilige Kirche Gottes.* Regensburg: Verlagsanstalt. Pp. 1146, 8vo, 14.40 mk.

Ausbreitung. *Die gegenwärtige, der altkatholischen Bewegung. Eine Uebersicht v. J. Wd. Essen: Bädcker.* Pp. 45, 8vo, 1 mk.

Bachmann, A., Prof. Dr. *Die deutschen Könige und die kurfürstliche Neutralität (1438-1447). Ein Beitrag zur Reichs- und Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands. Mit urkundl. Beilagen.* Wien. Pp. 236, 8vo, 4.40 mk.

Ball, C. J., Rev. *The Prophecies of Jeremiah: with a Sketch of his Life and Times. (The Expositor's Bible. 3d Series.)* New York: Armstrong, 1890. Pp. iii., 434, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Bancroft, J. M. *Deaconesses in Europe, and their Lessons for America; with Introduction by E. G. Andrews.* New York: Hunt, 1889. Pp. iv., 264, 12mo, \$1.

Barnbiller, Thdr. *von Widerlegung der Kritik der reinen Vernunft.* Prag u. Leipzig: Freytag. Pp. viii., 319, 8vo, 10.50 mk.

Beet, Joseph Agar, Rev. *The Credentials of the Gospel. A Statement of the Reason of the Christian Hope.* London: C. H. Kelly [1890]. Pp. 208, demy 8vo, paper, 1s. 6d.; cloth, 2s. 6d.

Behrends, A. J. F., D.D. *The Philosophy of Preaching.* New York: Scribner, 1890. 12mo, \$1.

Berdoo, Edward. *Browning's Message to his Times, his Religion, Philosophy and Science. With Portrait of Mr. Browning, and Letters in Fac-simile.* New York: Scribner & Welford, 1890. 12mo, cloth, \$1.40.

Bersier, Eugene, Rev. *St. Paul's Vision, and Other Sermons. Translated by Marie Stewart.* New York: Randolph. Pp. viii., 286, 12mo, 75 cts.

Bettany, G. T. *The World's Religions. Part 6.* New York: Christian Literature Co., 1890. Pp. 321-384, 8vo.

Blackburn, C. H. *The Trial of Jesus from a Lawyer's View.* Cincinnati: Clarke, 1890. Pp. ii., 68, paper, 60 cts.

Blackie, J. S. *Essays on Subjects of Moral and Social Interest.* Edinburgh: Douglas. Pp. 316, 8vo, 5s.

Böhl, Ed., Prof., Dr. *Von der Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben. Ein Beitrag zur Rettung des protestantischen Cardinaldogmas.* Amsterdam, Leipzig: Wilmann. Pp. iv., 327, 8vo, 7 mk.

Bonar, Horatius, D.D. *Until the Day Break, and Other Hymns Left Behind.* London: Hodder. 8vo, 5s.

Bouchot, Jacques Callot: *sa vie, son œuvre et ses continuations.* Paris: Hachette. Pp. vi., 246, avec 37 vign., 18mo, 2.25 fr.

Brinton, Daniel G., M.D., and Davidson, Thomas, M.A. *Giordano Bruno: Philosopher and Martyr. Two Addresses.* Philadelphia: McKay. Pp. 68, 8vo, 75 cts.

Brunel, Louis. *Les Vandois des Alpes françaises et de Freissinières en particulier, leur Passé, leur avenir.* 2e. ed., revue et augmentée avec Gravures et Carte. 8vo, 7.50 fr.

Caird, Edward. *The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant.* Glasgow: MacLehose. 2 vols.

Carpenter, J. E. *The First Three Gospels: Their Origin and Relations. (Biblical Manuals.)* London: S. S. Assoc. Pp. 406, 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Cart, J. *Histoire de la Liberté des Cultes dans le Canton de Vaud, 1798-1889.* Lausanne. 8vo, 4 fr.

Chadwick, G. A. *The Book of Exodus. (Expositor's Bible.)* London: Hodder. Pp. 462, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Chevalier, U. *Repertorium Hymnologicum. Catalogue des chants, hymnes, proses, séquences, tropes en usage dans l'église latine depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours. (En 4 fasc.)* 1. fasc. Louvain, 1889. Pp. 27, 8vo, 10 mk.

Church, Alfred J., and Seeley, Richmond. *The Hammer. A Story of Maccabean Times. With Illustrations by John Jellicoe.* New York: Putnam's. Pp. x., 312, 8vo, \$1.25.

Conway, J., Rev. *Rational Religion.* Milwaukee: Hoffmann, 1890. Pp. 176, 12mo, cloth, \$1.

Cook, E. W., Rev., A.M. *Theory of the Moral System, containing a Plan of the Universe in its Relations to the Creation, Sin, Punishment, and Redemption of Moral Beings.* Burlington, Vt. Pp. 218, 8vo.

Cooper, T. *A Biographical Dictionary, containing Concise Notices of Eminent Persons of all Ages and Countries, with a Supplement, bringing the work down to the end of the year 1882.* London: Bell. 2 vols. 12mo, 5s. each.

Craven, Augustus, Mme. *Le Père Damien.* Paris: Perrin, 1890. Pp. 137, 1 portr., 8vo, 2.50 fr.

Crooks, George R., Rev., D.D. *The Life of Bishop Matthew Simpson, of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* New York: Harper. Pp. xii., 512, 8vo.

Crosby, Howard. *Seven Churches in Asia; or, Worldliness in the Church.* New York: Funk. Pp. 168, 8vo, 75 cts.

Dalman, Gust. H., Lic. Dr. *Jesaja 53, das Prophetenwort vom Sühnen des Heilmittlers mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der synagogalen Literatur.* Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. iv., 55, 8vo, 1 mk.

Delitzsch, Franz. *Assyrisches Wörterbuch zur gesammten bisher veröffentlichten Keilschriftliteratur.* Leipzig: Hinrichs. Lfg. 3. @ 30 mk.

Delitzsch, Franz. *Der tiefe Graben zwischen alter und moderner Theologie. Ein Bekenntnis.* 2. Aufl. Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. 18, 8vo, 50 pf.

Delitzsch, Franz. *Messianische Weissagungen in geschichtlicher Folge.* Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. vii., 160, 8vo, 3.60 mk.; geb., 4.50 mk.

Dixon, A. C. (Editor.) *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit.* Baltimore: Wharton. Pp. vi., 187, 12mo, 75 cts.

Douais, C. *Un nouveau Manuscrit de Bernard Gui et des Chroniques des Papes d'Avignon.* Toulouse, Paris: Picard, 1890. Pp. 40, 4to.

- Dräseke, B.** Ausgewählte Predigten. Mit einer einheitl. Monographie v. G. Viehweger. Leipzig: Richter, 1890. Pp. xxv., 173, 8vo, 1.60 mk.
- Du Brouil, V.** La légende du Messie. Précis historique. Paris: Vanier, 1890. Pp. xxvi., 398, 8vo, 5 fr.
- Düsterwald, F.** Die Weltreiche u. das Gottesreich nach den Weissagungen d. Propheten Daniel. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1890. Pp. viii., 194, 8vo, 2.50 mk.
- Ebner, Adb., Dr.** Die klösterlichen Gebets-Verbrüderungen bis zum Ausgange des karolingischen Zeitalters. Eine kirchengeschichtliche Studie. Regensburg: Pustet. Pp. viii., 158, 8vo, 2 mk.
- Ehni, J.** Der vedische Mythos d. Yama, verglichen mit den analogen Typen der persönlichen griech. und german. Mythologie. Strassburg: Trübner, 8vo, 5 mk.
- Eimer, G. H. Theodor, Prof. Dr.** Organic Evolution as the Result of the Inheritance of Acquired Characters according to the Laws of Organic Growth. Translated by J. T. Cunningham, M.A., F.R.S.E. London and New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xxviii., 435, 8vo, \$3.25.
- Expositor, Indices to the.** 3d series. 10 vols. London: Hodder. 8vo, 1s.
- Farrar, Fredk. W., D.D.** The Gospel according to Luke. With Introduction and Notes. (Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools.) New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. 160, 16mo, cloth, 30 cts.
- Farrar, Frederick W., D.D., F.R.S.** Truths to Live by. A companion to "Every-day Christian Life." New York: Whittaker. Pp. vii., 372, 12mo, \$1.25.
- Ferguson, The** Philosophy of Civilization. A Sociological Study. The Hague: Nijhoff. Pp. vi., 20, 32, 8vo, 4.50 fl.
- Flebig, E.** Ueber die Selbstverleugnung bei den Hauptvertretern der deutschen Mystik d. Mittelalters. Leipzig: Fock. 1.20 mk.
- Finck.** Uebersicht der Geschichte des souveränen ritterlichen Ordens St. Johannis vom Spital zu Jerusalem und der Bailey Brandenburg. Leipzig: Teubner, 8vo, 3.60 mk.
- Fisher, George Park, D.D., LL.D.** The Nature and Method of Revelation. New York: Scribners, 1890. Pp. xiii., 291, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.
- Florin, Joh. Wilh.** 80 der schönsten und gebräuchlichsten evangelischen Kirchenlieder. Lebensbilder der Dichter, Geschichten und Erläuterungen, für Kirche, Schule und Haus, erzählt und ausgearbeitet. Cassel: Freyschmidt, 1889. Pp. iv., 168, 8vo, 1.30 mk.
- Fronmüller, G. F. C.** Die Briefe Petri u. der Brief Judä, theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet. 4. Aufl., besorgt von L. Füller. (Lange's Bibelwerk.) Bielefeld: Velhagen, 1890. Pp. v., 158, 8vo, 1.60 mk.
- Gall, James, Rev.** The Synagogue not the Temple the Germ and Model of the Christian Church. London: Simpkin, 5s.
- Godet, F.** Études bibliques. 2e série: Nouveau Testament. 4me édition. Neuchâtel: Delachaux; Paris: Monnerat, 1889. Pp. 407, 12mo, \$1.35.
- God in His World.** An Interpretation. New York: Harper. Pp. xii., 270, 8vo, \$1.25.
- Gray, George Zabriske.** Baldwin Lectures. The Church's Certain Faith. New York: Houghton. Pp. xii., 228, 8vo, \$1.50.
- Greer, D. H., Rev.** The Historical Christ, the Moral Power of History. New York: Dutton. \$1.
- Grill, J.** Zur Kritik der Komposition d. Buchs Hiob. Tübingen: Fues, 1890. Pp. 80, 4to.
- Grünwald, M.** Ueber den Einfluss der Psalmen auf die Entstehung der katholischen Liturgie mit steter Rücksichtnahme auf die talmudisch-midrassische Literatur. I. Hft. Frankfurt a. M.: Kaufmann. 1 mk.
- Guinness, H. Grattan, Mrs.** The New World of Central Africa. With a History of the First Christian Mission on the Congo. With Maps, Portraits, and Illustrations. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. xx., 535, 8vo.
- Gundlach, W.** Der Streit der Bischöfe Arles und Vienne um den Primatus Galliarum. Ein philologisch-diplomatisch-historischer Beitrag. Hannover: Hahn. Pp. xxii., 294, 8vo, 6 mk.
- Hahn, H. V.** Fragen über Raum, Zeit, und Gott. Zur Prüfung einer jeden Weltanschauung, hinsichtlich ihrer allgemeinen Grundlagen besprochen. Stuttgart: Brenwald, 1889. Pp. 120, 8vo, 1.50 mk.
- Harris, William T., LL.D.** The Spiritual Sense of Dante's "Divina Comedia." New York: Appleton, 1890. 16mo, cloth, \$1.
- Hasenclever, Adf., Past. Dr.** Aus Geschichte und Kunst des Christenthums. Abhandlungen zur Belehrung für gebildete Gemeindeglieder. 1. Reihe. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1890. Pp. vii., 214, 8vo, 2 mk.; gebunden, 3 mk.
- Hatch, Edwin, D.D.** Memorials of. Sometime Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Rector of Purleigh. Edited by his brother. London: Hodder, 1890. Crown 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Heanley, R. M., M.A., Oxon.** A Memoir of Edward Steere, D.D., LL.D. (Third Missionary Bishop in Central Africa.) With Portrait, four Illustrations, and Map. London: Bell, 1890. 3d ed. 8vo, 5s.
- Hetherington, W. M., D.D., LL.D.** History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Edited by Robert Williamson, D.D. Rev. ed. New York: Randolph. Pp. xix., 479, 12mo, \$2.
- Hirzel.** Gleichnisse und Metaphern im Rigveda in cultur-historischer Hinsicht zusammengestellt und verglichen aus den Bildern bei Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus, Sophokles und Euripides. Leipzig: Friedrich. 8vo, 3 mk.
- Hochart, P.** Études d'histoire religieuse. (I. Le rétablissement du royaume d'Israël. II. Le royaume de Dieu. III. La resurrection. IV. Les qualifications des disciples, etc.) Paris: Thorin, 1890. Pp. xiv., 419, 8vo, 8 fr.
- Hodder, Edwin.** Conquests of the Cross. A Record of Missionary Work throughout the World. With numerous illustrations. Vol. I. London: Cassell. 9s.
- Hopkins, John Henry, S.T.D.** Articles on Romanism, Monism, Capel, Dr. Littleale. New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. v., 200, 12mo, cloth, \$1.
- How Shall we Revise?** A Bundle of Papers by L. J. Evans, Marvin R. Vincent, S. M. Hamilton, E. N. White, C. H. Parkhurst, C. L. Thompson, and C. A. Briggs. New York: Scribners. Pp. viii., 214, 12mo, cloth, \$1; paper, 50 cts.
- Hunter, P. Hay.** After the Exile. A Hundred Years of Jewish History and Literature. Part I. The Close of the Exile to the Coming of Ezra. Edinburgh and London, 1890. Pp. xxx., 330, 8vo, 5s.
- Hymns, Ancient and Modern.** Complete ed. Tonic soli-fa. London: Clowes. 8vo, 1s. 10d., 2s. 4d., etc.
- Irvine, C.** The Lord's Supper; or, Holy Communion treated of, according to the Doctrine of Scripture and the Reformed Anglican Church. London: Stack, 1889. 8vo, 2s. 6d.
- Jensen, P.** Die Kosmologie der Babylonier. Studien und Materialien. Mit einem mythologischen Anhang und 3 Karten. Strassburg: Trübner, 1890. Pp. xvi., 546, 8vo, 40 mk.
- Jepheth Abu Ali, the Karaites.** Anecdota Oxoniensia. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Edited and translated by D. S. Margoliouth. New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xiii., 87, 4to, cloth, \$5.25.
- Jeremie, Liber.** Textum masoreticum accuratissime expressit, e fontibus masore varis illustravit, notis criticis confirmavit S. Baer. Prefatus est operis Fr. Delitzsch. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. Pp. xii., 147, 8vo, 1.50 mk.
- Joly, H.** Eléments de morale, suivis d'Eléments de Philosophie scientifique, répondant aux Programmes de Morale et de Philosophie de la quatrième et de la sixième Année de l'Enseignement secondaire spécial, conformément au Plan d'Études du 10 Août 1886. 2e ed. Paris: Delalain. Pp. viii., 304, 12mo, 2.50 fr.
- Jones, Lloyd, R. Owen.** His Life, Times, and Labors. Edited by William Cairns Jones. With 2 Portraits and Facsimile. London: Sonnenschein. Pp. 430, 8vo, 6s.
- Kaftan, J.** Brauchen wir ein neues Dogma? Neue Betrachtungen über Glaube und Dogma. Bielefeld: Velhagen, 1890. Pp. 77, 8vo, 0.75 mk.
- Kalischer, A. Ch. Heine's** Verhältnis zur Religion. Dresden: Oehlmann, 1890. Pp. 72, 8vo, 1.30 mk.
- Ken, Thomas.** Bishop of Bath and Wells. The Life and Letters of. With Portrait, Facsimiles, and numerous Illustrations. By the Dean of Wells. 2 vols. London: Hodder. 8vo, 32s.
- Kitchin, J. G.** The Bible Student in the British Museum. A Descriptive Guide to the Principal Antiquities which Illustrate and Confirm the Sacred History. London: Cassell. Pp. 80, 12mo, 1s.
- Knabenbauer, J.** Cursus Scripturae sacre. Commentarius in Ezechielem prophetam. Paris: Letheilieux, 1890. Pp. 543, 8vo, 9 fr.

Kurtz, Professor. Church History. Translated by the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A. In 3 vols. Vol. 3. New York: Funk. Pp. xvi., 544, 8vo, \$2.

Lagarde, Paul de. Ueber einige Berliner Theologen und was von ihnen zu lernen ist. Göttingen: Dieterich. 1.60 mk.

Laidlaw, John, D.D. The Miracles of our Lord. Expository and Homiletic. London: Hodder, 1890. 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

Lasswitz, Kurd. Geschichte der Atomistik vom Mittelalter bis Newton. I. Die Erneuerung der Korpuskulartheorie. Hamburg und Leipzig: Voss, 1890. Pp. xii., 518, 8vo, \$7.40.

Lefroy, W. The Christian Ministry: Its Origin, Constitution, Nature, and Work. A Contribution to Pastoral Theology. The Donellan Lectures Delivered before the University of Dublin, 1887-88. London: Hodder. Pp. 578, 8vo, 14s.

Le Strange, Guy. Palestine Under the Moslems. A Description of Syria and the Holy Land. From A.D. 650 to 1500. Translated from the Works of the Medieval Arab Geographers. With Maps and Illustrations. New York: Houghton. Pp. xxii., 603, 8vo, \$3.

Liquori, St. Alph. de. Pratique de l'Amour envers Jésus-Christ, tirée des paroles de Saint Paul, présentée aux Ames qui désirent assurer leur Salut éternel et tendre à la Perfection. Tours: Mame. Pp. 383, 32mo.

Lloyd, Julius, Rev. Sermons on the Prophets. London: Bell. 8vo, 5s.

Lods, A. La Législation des Cultes Protestants (1787-1887.) Recueil complet des Lois, Ordonnances, Décrets, Arrêtés ministériels et avis du Conseil d'Etat relatifs aux Eglises Protestantes de Novembre 1787 à Janvier 1887. Avec une Préface d'E. de Presencé. Paris, 1890. Pp. xvi., 275, 8vo.

Loserth, J. Beiträge zur Geschichte der hussitischen Bewegung. IV: Die Streitschriften und Unionsverhandlungen zwischen den Katholiken und Hussiten im Jahre 1412 und 1413. Wien. Pp. 127, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

MacArthur, Robert S. Christ, and Him Crucified. New York: Funk. Pp. 294, 8vo, 75 cts.

Majunke, Paul. Luther's Lebensende. Eine historische Untersuchung. Mainz: Kupferberg, 1890. Pp. 80, 8vo, 45 cts.

Manning, S. "Those Holy Fields." Palestine Illustrated by Pen and Pencil. New and improved ed. London: Tract Soc. 8vo, 8s.

Martineau, James, D.D., LL.D. The Seat of Authority in Religion. London and New York: Longmans, 1890. Pp. xii., 664, 8vo, \$4.50.

Matheson, George, Rev., M.A., D.D. Landmarks of New Testament Morality. New York: Revell. Pp. 266, 8vo, \$1.50.

Mayrhofer, J. Der Katholizismus u. der Altkatholizismus in seinem Glaubensbekenntnis, nach bewährten Autoren kurz zusammengefasst. Wien: Woerl, 1890. Pp. 177, 8vo, 1.30 mk.

Meyer (H. A. W.). Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. I. Abth. I. Hälfte. Das Matthäusevangelium. 8te Aufl., neu bearbeitet von B. Weiss. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1890. Pp. lv., 500, 8vo, 7 mk.; geb., 8.60 mk.

Millar, J. P. The Preacher's Homiletical Commentary on the Book of Judges. London: Dickinson, 1889. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Mombert, J. I. D.D. A Hand-Book of the English Versions of the Bible. 2d ed. New York: Appleton, 1890. Cloth.

Montefeltro, Agostino, da, Padre. Selections from the Sermons of. Edited by Catherine Mary Phillimore. 1st series. New York: Pott, 1890. Pp. x., 174, 12mo, cloth, \$1; boards, 50 cts.

Montgomery, M. W. The Mormon Delusion: Its History, Doctrine, and the Outlook in Utah. Boston and Chicago. Pp. 354, 8vo.

Mosapp, Herrn., Dr. Karl Gerok. Ein Bild seines Lebens und Wirkens. Mit dem Bildnisse Geroks. Stuttgart: Greiner, 1890. Pp. vi., 84, 12mo, 1 mk.

Müller, Johs., Dr. Der Begriff der sittlichen Unvollkommenheit bei Descartes u. Spinoza. Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. 61, 8vo, 2 mk.

Neumann, Karl Johannes. Die Römische Staat und die Allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian. Bd. I. Leipzig: Veit, 1890. Pp. xii., 334, 8vo, 7 mk.

Nippold, Frdr. Karl v. Hase. Gedächtnisrede in der Jener Stadtkirche am 6. Jan. 1890. Berlin: Wiegandt. Pp. 16, 8vo, 50 pf.

Novum Testamentum Graece, cum lectionibus variis et lexico graeco-latino ad usum scholarum. Editio Jos. Perin. Patavi, 1890. Pp. xiii., 538, 206, 8vo.

Papillaud, J. Le Faux Dieu des Juifs, des Chrétiens, et des Mahométans. Le Passé et l'Avenir de l'Humanité. La Rochelle: Siret. Pp. 244, 18mo, 3.50 fr.

Parker, Joseph, D.D. The Psalter: Discourses upon Holy Scripture. (People's Bible, Vol. XII.) London: Hodder. 8vo, cloth, 8s.

Patzig, E. De Nonnians in IV. Orationes Gregorii Nazianzenii Commentaria. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1.50 mk.

Pearson, R. G., Rev. Truth Applied; or, Bible Readings. Nashville, Tenn.: Cumb. Presby. Pub. House, 1890. Pp. 244, 16mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Peisson, Z. Histoire des Religions de l'Extreme-Orient, 1re partie: Lao-Tsen et le Taoïsme. Amiens: Rousseau-Leroy, 1890. Pp. 127, 8vo.

Perrero, D. Il rimpatrio del valdesi del 1699 e i suoi cooperatori: saggio storico su documenti inediti. Torino: Casanova, 1890. Pp. 102, 16mo, 75 cts.

Perrodon, J. C., Rev. Catholicity vs. Protestantism: Conversations of a Catholic Missionary with Americans. 2d ed. Milwaukee: Hoffmann, 1890. Pp. 338, 12mo, cloth, \$1.

Perrot, Georges, and Chipiez, C. History of Art in Sardinia, Judea, Syria, and Asia Minor. Edited by W. Armstrong. 2 vols. New York: Armstrong, 1890. 8vo, cloth, \$14.50.

Flugl-Hartung. Geschichte des Mittelalters. 1. Thl. Berlin: Grote, 1890. Pp. v., 761, Royal 8vo.

Philippson, Ludw., Dr. Die Rhetorik und jüdische Homiletik. In Briefen und Abhandlungen. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben von Dr. M. Kayserling. Leipzig: Grieben. Pp. iv., 119, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Pollard, Bedford. The God of the Children; or, How the Voices of Nature Speak to Us. London: Stock. 8vo, cloth, 4s. 6d.

Poole, George Ayliffe. Saint Cyprian: His Life and Times. With a Prefatory Notice of the Author. (Anc. and Mod. Lib. Theol. Lit.) London: Griffith. Pp. 276, 8vo, 1s.

Porret, J. A. Les Éléments essentiels de la Religion. Étude psychologique et historique. Lausanne: Payot, 1890. Pp. 60, 8vo, 1.90 fr.

Portig, A. Evangelische Bewegungen in der Katholischen Kirche im 18. und im Anfang d. 19. Jahrhunderte. Ein Wort zur Beschämung für die Gegenwart, zur Hoffnung für die Zukunft. Bremen: Nöcker, 1890. Pp. 36, 8vo, 60 mk.

Preis, H. Vorgeschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Program, Königsberg in P.: 1890. Pp. 32, 4to.

The Pulpit Commentary, edited by H. D. M. Spence and by Joseph S. Exell. II. Kings. Exposition and Homilies by G. Rawlinson. Homilies by various Authors. London: Paul, 1890. Pp. xvi., 504, v., 8vo, 15s.

Religious Systems of the World: National, Christian and Philosophic. A Collection of Addresses Delivered at South Place Institute in 1888-89. Revised, and in some cases re-written by the authors. London: Sonnenschein, 1889. Pp. 554, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Renan, Ernest. Studies of Religious History. Authorized Translation, from the latest revised and corrected ed. London: Heinemann. 8vo, 10s.

Repetitorien über die theologischen Disciplinen. Bearb. auf Grund verschiedener darauf bezügl. Werke älteren und neueren Datums. Nr. 1 und 2. Inhalt: I. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Pp. 123. II. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Pp. 139. Berlin: Schultze, 1890. 8vo, 2 mk.

Robinson, C. S., D.D. Studies in Luke's Gospel. 2d ser. New York: Am. Tract Soc., 1890. Pp. iii., 319, cloth, \$1.25; paper, 50 cts.

Röhm, J. B. Zur Tetzl-Legende. Offener Brief. Hildesheim: Borgmeyer, 1890. Pp. 33, 8vo, 0.30 mk.

Rosenthal. Die monistische Philosophie. Ihre Wesen, ihre Vergangenheit und Zukunft, für die gebildeten aller Stände dargestellt. Leipzig: Friedrich. 8vo, 3 mk.

Ross, A. Hastings, Rev., D.D. A Manual of Congregationalism. New ed., revised and enlarged. Oberlin, O.: Goodrich. \$1.

Bow, C. A., Rev., D.D., etc. Christian Theism. (See Bibliography of March, 1890.) New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. viii., 318, 12mo, cloth, \$1.75.

Runciman, James. Joins in our Social Armor. London: Hodder. 8vo, cloth, 8s.

Sack. Die altjüdische Religion im Uebergange vom Bibeltum zum Talmudismus. Berlin: Dümmler, 1889. 8vo, 7 mk.

Sack. Die Religion Altisraels, nach den in der Bibel enthaltenen Grundzügen dargestellt. 2. Aufl. Berlin: Dümmler. 8vo, 2.40 mk.

The Samaritan Chronicle; or, The Book of Joshua the Son of Nun. Translated from the Arabic, with Notes by Oliver Turnbull Crane, A.M., Member of the American Oriental Society. New York: John B. Alden, 1890. Pp. 178, 12mo, cloth.

Schäfer, B. Die Apostelgeschichte ist keine Geschichte der Apostel, sondern eine Apologie der Kirche. Frankfurt a. M.: Foeffer, 1890. Pp. 32, 8vo, 50 mk.

Scheek, A. De fontibus Clementis Alexandrini. Program. Augustæ Vindelicorum. 1889. Pp. 51, 8vo.

Schlumberger, Gustave. Un Empereur Byzantin au Xe Siècle. Nicéphore Phocas. Avec 4 chromos, 3 cartes et 240 gravures. 4to, 30 fr.

Schmid, M. Die Darstellung der Geburt Christi in der bildenden Kunst. Entwicklungsgeschichtliche Studie. Stuttgart: Hoffmann, 1890. Pp. vi., 128, 63 Illustrations, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

Schopenhauer, A. The Wisdom of Life. Being the First Part of "Aphorismen zur Lebensweisheit." London: Sonnenschein. Pp. 156, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Schulze, L. August Neander. Ein Gedenkblatt für Israel u. die Kirche. Leipzig: Faber, 1890. Pp. iii., 64, 8vo, 1 mk.

Schwane, Jos., Prof. Dogmengeschichte der neueren Zeit. (Seit 1517 n. Chr.) Freiburg i. Br.: Herder. Pp. x., 415, 8vo, 5 mk.; geb., 6.75 mk.

Scott, J. Buddhism and Christianity. A Parallel and a Contrast. Edinburgh: Douglas. Pp. xiv., 301, 8vo.

Semler, C. H. Die Weltanschauung Luthers und Goethes u. ihre Bedeutung f. unsere Zeit. Hamburg, 1890. Pp. 39, 8vo, 1 mk.

Seth, A. Scottish Philosophy. A Comparison of the Scottish and German Answers to Hume. 2d ed. London: Blackwood. Pp. 220, 8vo, 5s.

Siegfried, C., Prof., D.D. Die theologische und die historische Betrachtung des alten Testaments. Vortrag. Frankfurt a. M.: Diesterweg. Pp. 28, 8vo, 40 pf.

Silvester. Apologie der orthodoxen griechisch-orientalischen Kirche der Bukowina. Czernowitz: Pardini, 1890. Pp. 60, 4to, 1.40 mk.

Smyth, J. P. The Old Documents and the New Bible. An Easy Lesson for the People in Biblical Criticism. The Old Testament. London: Bagster. Pp. 228, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Specilegio vaticano di documenti inediti e rari estratti dagli Archivi e dalla Biblioteca della Sede Apostolica. Vol. I. Fasc. 1. Rome: Loescher. 18 fr.

Spiegler, J. S. Geschichte der Philosophie d. Judenthums. Nach den neuesten Forschungen dargestellt. Leipzig: Friedrich. 8 mk.

Spurgeon, C. H. Twelve Striking Sermons. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1885. Pp. 144, 8vo, cloth, 50 cts.

Stanbrough, Rufus M. The Scriptural View of Divine Grace: Is it Universalist, Arminian, or Calvinistic? Ten Propositions. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. viii., 631, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Stanley, Cady. The Teachings of Jesus. Selected from the Gospels. Cleveland, O.: Burrows. Pp. iv., 117, 8vo, \$1.

Stephenson, H. M. Christ, the Life of Men. The Hulsean Lectures for 1888. New York: Macmillan.

Sterrett, J. Macbride, D.D. Studies in Hegel's Philosophy of Religion. With a chapter on Christian Unity in America. (Pp. 309-348. 12mo, paper, gratis.) New York: Appleton, 1890. Pp. xlii., 348, 12mo, cloth, \$2.

Totten, Charles A. L. The Romance of History. Lost Israel Found; or, Jeshurun's Pilgrimage. Introduction by Professor C. Piazzl Smyth. New Haven: 1890. Paper.

Townesend, G. F. Jehovah-Jesus, the Divine Appearances under the Patriarchal, Levitical, and Christian Dispensations. London: Nisbet. Pp. 236, 8vo, 5s.

Travaux de la deuxième assemblée générale de l'association protestante pour l'étude pratique des questions sociales. Lyon, 11, 12, 13 nov. 1889. Paris: Fischbacher, 1890. Pp. 224, 8vo, 2.50 fr.

Van der Haeghen, Ferd.; Arnold, Th. J. I.; Berghs, R. Vanden. Bibliographie des Martyrologes Protestantes Néerlandais. Extrait de la Bibliotheca Belgica ou Bibliographie générale des Pays Bas. 2 dln. La Haye: Nijhoff, 1890. Pp. iv., 104, 738; iv., 860, 8vo, 20 fr.

Van Dyke, Henry, D.D. God and Little Children. The Blessed State of All who Die in Childhood Proved and Taught as a part of the Gospel of Christ. New York: Randolph, 1890. Pp. iv., 81, 12mo, cloth, \$1.

Verrall, Margaret de G. Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens. Being a Translation of a Portion of the "Attic" of Pausanias. With Introductory Essay and Archaeological Commentary by Jane E. Harrison. With Illustrations and Plans. New York: Macmillan. 12mo, \$4.50.

Voragine, Jacobi a. Legenda Aurea vulgo historia Lombardica dicta. Ad optimorum librorum fidem recensuit Dr. Th. Graesse. Edit. tertia. Vratislavia: Koebner, 1890. Pp. x., 938, 8vo, \$8.80.

Walsh, W. Pakenham, Right Rev., D.D., Lord Bishop of Ossory. The Voices of the Psalms. London: Hodder. 8vo, cloth, 5s.

Walther, J. Les Découvertes de Ninive et de Babylone au point de Vue Biblique. Conférences. Avec 25 figures. Lausanne. 12mo, 4 fr.

Watier, A. Calvin Predicateur. Étude. Genève: Beroud, 1889. Pp. 128, 8vo, 2 fr.

Weaver, Jonathan, Bishop, D.D., Editor. Christian Doctrine. A Comprehensive View of Doctrinal and Practical Theology. By Thirty-seven Different Writers. Dayton, O.: U. B. Pub. House. Pp. xvi., 611, 8vo, \$2.25.

Weiss, Hermann. Einleitung in die christliche Ethik. Freiburg: Mohr, 1889. Pp. viii., 240, 8vo, 5 mk.

Wells, James, Rev. Rescuers and Rescued: Experiences Among our City Poor. London: Hodder. Pp. 256, 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

Wernicke. Die Religion des Wissens als Zukunftsideal. Leipzig: Friedrich. 8vo, 3 mk.

What is Truth? A Consideration of the Doubts as to the Efficacy of Prayer Raised by Evolutionists, Materialists, and Others. By "Nemo." London: Paul. Pp. 202, 8vo, 5s.

Wilhelm, J., and Scannell, T. B. A Manual of Catholic Theology. Based on Scheeben's "Dogmatik." With a Preface by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Vol. I. London: Paul. Pp. 550, 8vo, 15s.

Wilkins, W. J. Daily Life and Work in India. With 59 Illustrations. London: Unwin. Pp. 288, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Willard, Frances E. Glimpses of Fifty Years. An Autobiography. Chicago: Smith.

Witt, H. Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus zum mosaischen Gesetz. Program, Halle a. Saale.: 1889. Pp. 12, 4to.

Wood, Theodore, Rev. J. G. Wood, his Life and Work. With a Portrait. London: Cassell. Pp. 310, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

NOTICES OF MAGAZINES.

HARPER'S for June contains one article of interest to the friends of missions—a finely illustrated description of a trip "Through the Caucasus," by Vicomte Eugene Melchior de Vogüe, whose recent writing on Russia in this magazine will be pleasantly recalled.

THE CENTURY for May is largely taken up with Washington. Many portraits and relics are given. Marie Bashkirtseff has another appearance. May we hope it is her last? Her self-made likeness does not flatter her, as far as looks go, we prefer "The Women of the French Salon," but the drawings reproduced show that she was a clever artist.

THE great, indeed unique, interest in **SCRIBNER'S** for June is Mr. Stanley's article, which contains a remarkable confession of faith in God under trying circumstances: "Constrained at the darkest hour to humbly confess that without God's help I was helpless, I vowed a vow in the forest solitudes that I would confess His aid before men. Silence, as of death, was round about me; it was midnight; I was weakened by illness, prostrated by fatigue, and wan with anxiety for my white and black companions, whose fate was a mystery. In this physical and mental distress I besought God to give me back my people. Nine hours later we were exulting with a rapturous joy. In full view of all was the crimson flag with the crescent, and beneath its waving folds was the long-lost rear column."

THE COSMOPOLITAN for June has an excellent article on "Farm Life and Irrigating in Persia," by S. G. W. Benjamin, and another by Lafcadio Hearn on "Half-Breed Races in the West Indies." Miss Bland writes enthusiastically, in almost childish delight, over Japan, in which land she spent part of two days (!) in the course of her flying trip around the world.

THE MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN HISTORY for May has the usual variety of matter, though with the exception of a short article on the Massachusetts Bay Psalm Book, A.D. 1640, nothing of directly religious interest.